

THE CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CLII.]

AUGUST, 1857.

[Vol. XIII.]

M. SIMON ON LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE.*

MONSIEUR SIMON has added another leaf to the crown of laurels which every wellwisher of his race has already awarded him for his noble efforts—in his excellent works, “*Le Devoir*” and “*La Religion Naturelle*”—to win his countrymen from the constant occupation of material things to the contemplation of higher views of truth and duty, and to redeem their literature from the accusation of prevailing sensualism that has, unfortunately with too much truth, been brought against it, by the publication of the lectures lately delivered by him in Belgium in defence of liberty of conscience.

“ — Conscience, that sole monarchy in man,
Owing allegiance to no earthly prince;
Made by the edict of creation free;
An individual sovereignty, that none
Created might, unpunished, bind or touch;
Unbound, save by the eternal laws of God,
And unamenable to all below.”

The recent attempt of the Roman Catholic Church in Belgium to interfere with the established law of public education and to introduce an episcopal censorship, with the debate consequent upon it in the Chamber, is no doubt fresh in our readers' memories. In speaking of it, M. de Decker, the Minister of the Interior, in his able speech, said, “*On dirait qu'un souffle d'intolérance est passé sur la Belgique.*” This “breath of intolerance,” however, soon raised a blast of honest indignation in defence of the great principles attacked.

At the opening of the Free University of Brussels, M. Verhagen made a remarkable speech, in which he reminded his hearers of the melancholy prescriptions of the fourth Council of Lateran, which make “intolerance” a “positive duty.” “When you deny the principles of '89,” he observed to his opponents, “when you attack the constitution of the country, you lose the character of a church and become a political party,—a party bent upon assaulting the State, and who sees the ideal of human society nowhere but in the theocratic absolutism of Rome.” At Ghent, the two Professors of Philosophy, M. Léon Nocquier and M. Cullier, also protested energetically against the outraged

* *La Liberté de Conscience.* Par Jules Simon. Paris—Hachette. 1857.
VOL. XIII. 2 I

rights of instruction and liberty of thought; other distinguished men followed on the same side. M. de Kerchove, President of the Literary Society of Ghent, with some other members who, M. Simon says, regard him as a friend, then invited him to pay them a visit to defend publicly "sentiments which they hold in common, and for the defence of which he is always ready." The Council of the University placed their great hall at his service, and he had thus an opportunity "of vindicating the rights of reason and of preaching toleration to an audience of three thousand persons." M. Simon speaks of himself as a "*libre penseur*;" but had we not had his own words for the fact, and had been called upon to decide upon his religious belief from his works, we should have called him a Christian. At any rate, we shall not be wrong in calling him a follower of Christ and an able defender of the great principles of his religion, however he may relinquish the name usually adopted by those who take him for their Lord and Master. Of M. Simon's opinions respecting the Christian religion, and the line he takes in his defence of the liberty of conscience, it is as well to quote his own words in the Introduction to the admirable little book now under our notice:

"Those who have taken the trouble to read my works know already that here they will find no attack upon the Christian religion. I have always felt myself bound to respect the sincere convictions of others when making the same request for my own. I am filled at once with admiration and respect for Christianity—that doctrine, so simple yet so profound, which teaches so clearly the unity of God and the immortality of the soul—whose morality is so pure and so full of charity—whose authority, alike over the greatest and the poorest intellects, for so many centuries, is so imposing. It has moreover a peculiarity which enchants me—the remarkable union of the most perfect, and, if I may be permitted to say so, the most efficacious simplicity with the profoundest metaphysics. The *Timæus* of Plato and the twelfth book of Aristotle's *Metaphysics* are most assuredly wonders; but no symbol will ever emanate from either which one could teach children to recite. Nothing but the Christian religion has ever yet contained at the same time the *Summa* of St. Thomas and a Catechism. And to-day, when it is attempted in the name of this religion to rob us of the liberty of thinking and to propound superstitions often immoral and nearly always absurd, is it impossible to resist these attempts without making war against the gospel? Is it not rather just and right to separate a religion of which love is the principle, from a party of whom hate is the breath and the life? This is what I would fain do. People may say, if they please, that I have chosen my enemy. I do not conceal it. My enemy is Intolerance, and I attack it wherever I meet with it,—among Christians, if I find it there, and, if needs be, among free-thinkers; for among us also there are intolerant minds. My first care in these lectures has been to exclude from the discussion all that was not properly belonging to the argument."

The rest of the Introduction is occupied in the examination of the relationship which may exist between religion and the State

in the several conditions of a church in absolute union with the State—the absolute separation of the State and all churches—the toleration of all churches by, and their regulated connection with, the State. The conclusion of the philosopher on this vexed subject, M. Simon considers to be too evident to need discussion. “*To establish a State religion is to found a society upon the negation of liberty of conscience,—at all times a crime.*” It follows, therefore, that, to be consistent with logic and reason, “the State must be founded upon the *absolute liberty* and the impartial treatment of all religious sects.” So much for the theory; but in the practice there are difficulties to be overcome which must be considered, and which he does not think in all cases easily surmountable. M. Simon speaks here of complications existing in old countries, and enumerates three of their sources which must be taken into account in any legislation on the subject. The first is the material condition of each sect; the second, the necessary connection of their ordinances with the principal circumstances of life; and the third, the character of the dogma and the constitution of the hierarchy in each church.

By “material conditions,” he means such as the buildings and the budget for their maintenance; by “their connection with the principal circumstances of life,” he refers to births, deaths, marriages and education.

The consideration of these topics leads him to the conclusion, that while State Churches are incompatible with liberty of conscience and every other kind of liberty, the entire separation of religion from the State is not desirable or possible in any country not entirely free. Thus in France, where no association is permitted by the Government without its sanction, where men are forbidden to meet together for the furtherance of a common object, there is no alternative but the interference of law, of a “concordat,” to regulate the action of the recognized religious bodies in their bearing upon the State and upon society. This interference of law does not mean the exclusive patronage of one religion to the exclusion of all others, but an equal distribution of justice to all recognized as legally existing. But our author adds, “Religious peace cannot result entirely from law. It is only solid and enduring when by the progress of philosophy it has become part of the manners and customs of a people.” M. Simon contrasts the impartiality of the French laws in the treatment of different sects with regard to mixed marriages, employment in Government offices, &c., with the intolerance of the Austrian, Russian, and other continental nations, and observes, that now “equality is not only recognized in France, but practised,—that no association, either public or private, troubles itself about a man’s particular religious opinions in judging of his character or in employing him, it being sufficient to know that he is well-conducted,—it is important to address

oneself to people's intellects to enlighten them, and to the customs of social life to correct them, in all that they still preserve of persecution and hatred."

"Do a hundred thousand men massacred for a cause serve it half so well as a good book?"—"Nothing is wanting to make Liberty invincible, but to make her known."—"The duty of the philosopher is not to defend his own right and his own liberty, but to defend right and liberty even to the profit of his enemies."—"I concur in the expression of D'Alembert, 'Unrestricted Liberty of thought and action is alone capable of producing anything great, and she needs but enlightenment to preserve her from all excess.' Because I am deeply penetrated with this sentiment, I do not feel myself entirely unworthy of this cause, of which I must continue all my days the obscure but devoted defender."

M. Simon begins his first lecture by disclaiming any intention of giving a history of intolerance, for "that would be to give the history of the world. It is a part of human nature to try constantly to induce others to share either its faith or its scepticism. According to the respect or the contempt felt for humanity, do the different parties attempt to influence the minds of their opponents by enlightening them or by deceiving and coercing them. Such is the constant antagonism of liberty and of oppression, of right and might." He then takes a glance at the aspect of society in the earliest records of civilized communities which have reached us, and observes that they rested on the principle of intolerance. India and Egypt were countries of castes, where everything was regulated on the acknowledgment of an inflexible hierarchy. Greece alone exhibits an example of liberty and philosophy. Beginning with Pythagoras and growing pure with Plato, philosophy establishes herself under Aristotle, and becomes with Stoicism the mistress and controller of manners (*mœurs*). But the sun of Greece soon sets; originality ceases, and imitation takes its place; a sterile eclecticism is content with generalizations only from the old systems. Rome, by depriving Greece of political liberty, contributed to this decay; for it is impossible for a people deprived of freedom of action to preserve any superiority of thought. Rome herself, great only in action, changed her character when she had no more worlds to conquer, and soon became the prey of ambitious men. It was then, when Greece was extinguished and Rome enslaved, that the birth of Christianity produced the greatest philosophical and social revolution ever seen. "And it is at this moment, in the presence of the first religion worthy the name," M. Simon adds, "that he proposes to begin the history of liberty of conscience."

A new school of philosophy among such a crowd of sophists and disputants as then filled Rome, would scarcely have moved a single mind. A new religion could establish itself without causing alarm to the ruling powers, for there was always a vacant

pedestal in the Capitol for any new divinity. But what appeared to the ancients an attempt against the majesty of the people was, that the Christians, not content with announcing a new god, proclaimed the destruction of all others. This *exclusive* religion struck the Romans with astonishment. Become tolerant in all matters of faith from indifference to any, they found themselves for the first time face to face with "religious intolerance." M. Simon calls particular attention to this remarkable fact of the first appearance in the world of religious intolerance. He observes,

"—that it was Christianity which first introduced it; for Judaism, confined to a corner of Asia, was unknown. You will see how 'civil intolerance' came into existence at the same time as, and for the purpose of opposing, 'religious intolerance;' and since that time—that is, since the day when, by the advent of a religious worship really worthy the name, liberty of conscience had become doubly necessary—you will traverse the whole field of history to the eve of the Revolution of 1789, without finding one philosopher who teaches the principle of toleration, or one nation which inscribes it in its laws."

M. Simon points out the essential character of religious intolerance, and in what it differs from all other forms of intolerance.

"The first principle of philosophy is liberty—that of religion is authority. It is fundamentally necessary that this authority should be irrefragable; for if the dogma is disputable, it re-enters the province of philosophy, and belongs to science, not to faith."

"Christianity" distinguishes itself from Paganism, in its claims for this authority, "by a tradition consecrated by history, going back without interruption to the origin of the world, renewed and sanctioned by a revelation of which it named the author, of which it could tell the exact date, and which resumed itself into a creed both clear and unique. It was founded, therefore, upon the declaration of God himself, to which nothing could be added, and of which nothing could be changed. No one could be a Christian if he did not accept the revealed doctrine in all its integrity, and did not renounce all other forms of faith. Nothing can be clearer than these consequences; and it follows from them that ecclesiastical intolerance is not only just, but necessary, and that any religion not professing it would stand, by that very fact, condemned."

"By this ecclesiastical intolerance I merely intend that intolerance which consists in rejecting any new dogmas or any modifications of the old ones; which addresses itself to the faithful alone, and in no case attacks the liberty of unbelievers; and which towards the faithful themselves attempts no temporal punishment, but confines itself to purely spiritual excommunication."—"It cannot be a matter of reproach to any church that she believes in her own dogmas, or that she rejects from her bosom those who dissent from them. She does nothing more in disowning them than confirm the position of their opinions; for no one should pretend to belong to a church whose faith he does not share. If the State attaches any temporal punishment to this excommunication, or otherwise constrains unbelievers, or even believers, to the outward acknowledgment of orthodoxy or the practice of religion, this interven-

tion of force in the affairs of the conscience no longer belongs to ecclesiastical intolerance. This is a new feature, for in the first instance the Church does violence to my reason in virtue of an authority which I freely acknowledge and which I am free to abandon; and in the second, the State does violence to my reason and my liberty by virtue of a faith which I reject."

When the Roman emperors first took notice of the new religion, they were far from understanding the real purport of religious intolerance. Paganism, long since presenting nothing more to all cultivated minds than symbolism, had become largely comprehensive. The proconsuls, imbued with these principles, did not ask the Christians to abandon their God, but only to offer sacrifice to the gods of the country. The Christians answered that there was but one God, and all others were vain idols. But this was directly to attack the State, for among the gods was the emperor himself. To refuse to offer sacrifice to him, was at once to proclaim themselves rebels as well as atheists. It was, therefore, thought only consistent with political justice to order the Christians to be interrogated by the proconsuls, and commanded to offer sacrifice to the gods of the empire. They were summoned and they appeared; but no means of persuasion or coercion could induce them to sacrifice to idols. They knew, ignorant and simple as they were, although their judges did not, that for them to do so would be apostacy. Entreaties failing, the lictors unbound their rods; but the Christians' courage grew under their blows. At last blood flowed.

Persecution had now begun, and civil intolerance entered on its bloody struggle with religious intolerance, and at the same time with liberty of conscience. The Christians only used their undoubted right in refusing to worship false gods; the Romans abused their power in trying to constrain them to make an external profession of a faith their consciences repelled. The apostles said to their disciples, "Believe on what we teach you in the name of God if you would inherit eternal life; but if you have not the faith of children, leave us and go in peace." The proconsuls said to those who were brought before their judgment-seat, "Disobey your conscience and your God, and worship the gods of the emperor, on pain of death." What could the Christians do? Their Master had told them, "Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's." They were ready to obey Cæsar in all that did not infringe the divine law. If Cæsar levied a tax, they were ready to pay it; if he asked their blood, they were ready to shed it. But when he commanded them to commit a crime, they had nothing left them but to resist unto death. Not, however, with arms in their hands. No; they had been taught if "any one smite you on one cheek, straightway offer him the other." They came like sheep to the slaughter, peaceable, unarmed, resigned.

Thus for three centuries did the Christians face death rather than yield obedience to an unlawful authority, and with their best blood bore gallant witness to the holy cause of liberty of conscience. But in spite of persecution, in spite of frightful punishments invented by the savage ingenuity of the proconsuls, the faith spread, until civil intolerance lost its first battle by its leader going over to the enemy. Constantine changed his opinions in one night, and the same man who in the evening had invoked the gods of the empire against the Christians, in the morning began to proscribe Paganism in the name of Jesus Christ. The same judges who formerly condemned the Christians in the name of the gods of Rome, now condemned the Donatists in the name of councils and the orthodox faith.

From this moment civil and religious intolerance were united and mutually supported each other. The Church became the enemy of the liberty which hitherto she had defended, and called in the aid of the secular arm to help her.

"It is true," says M. Simon, "that the Church instituted a milder persecution than she herself suffered under Diocletian. But it matters little whether the persecution be mild or severe; these are only different degrees of the same crime; and mild at the first onset, it never fails soon to become violent. A sort of fatality awaits the men who wish to conquer the reason of others without enlightening them. When we do not know how to act the part of apostles, we must be prepared sooner or later to become executioners."

A terrible sophistry characterized civil intolerance directly it had become the partner of religious intolerance. Persecution was for the victims' good; "it was to save them from hell;" and while ordering the most dreadful deaths, the tormentors called the sufferers "brothers," and considered themselves as only moved by pity when thus making the heretics by a few hours of pain purchase eternal life.

Philosophy mounted the throne with Julian, but liberty of conscience formed no part of his creed, and he found the easiest way of answering pamphlets addressed by the Christians to the philosopher was by edicts issued by the emperor. The distinction of heretics and orthodox was unknown to Julian, who treated all Christians alike, despoiling their churches under the pretext that their Scriptures commanded them to live in poverty, and either shutting up their schools altogether, or confining their instruction to Luke and Matthew; "for," as he said, "they are their theologians, as Homer and Hesiod are ours." At his death, the victims changed places once again, and henceforth for centuries civil intolerance was found united with the only doctrine which professed religious intolerance. Our space will not permit us to follow M. Simon over the wide field of persecution and suffering for conscience' sake which he has so ably explored. The history is indeed a most painful one, as he him-

self confesses. Spies, executioners, auto-da-fé, are the words of most constant occurrence; yet far from exaggerating or forcing the application of any of the facts he relates, he says, "Their history oppresses me, and I pass over the pages that contain them with a sorrow as deep as if I were crossing a field of battle when the armies have retired, and nothing is left but the bodies of the dead." One glorious name succeeds another in rapid succession as he details this martyrdom of thought, covering a space of fifteen centuries. For, spite of the dungeon, the gibbet and the stake, the mind of man would still assert itself, and still persist to glory in the liberty with which Christ had made it free. And other names occur as frequently,—not glorious, but odious,—the names of princes, temporal and spiritual, at whose mention one's blood runs cold as memory recalls the horrid deeds suggested by them. The Albigenses, the Vaudois, the Huguenots, St. Bartholomew, the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, the Dragonnades, — what painful reminiscences gather around them all! And the tyrant, Louis XIV., miscalled Great, covered with the blood of martyrs, yet bepraised and flattered by poets, historians and preachers of the gospel of peace, whom Bossuet could dare, even from the pulpit, to apostrophize thus:

"Touched by so many wonders, let us open our hearts to the influence of the piety of Louis. Let us raise our cries to heaven and exclaim of this other Constantine, this second Theodosius, this second Charlemagne, what the six hundred and thirty fathers said at the Council of Chalcedon: You have re-established the faith, you have exterminated the heretics; this is the work worthy of your reign; this is its proper character. Through you, heresy is no more. God alone could do this miracle. King of Heaven, O preserve the King of the earth! It is the aspiration of the Church; it is the anxious hope of the Bishops."

This, too, was the monarch who destroyed Port Royal, and who sent a bishop with armed men to eject the poor inoffensive nuns from their quiet home of years.

The persecution of the Protestants in France continued until 1787, only two years before the Declaration of the Rights of Man, when Louis the Sixteenth restored their civil rights. They themselves, crushed by centuries of injustice, did not presume to think of demanding their political rights. One is irresistibly reminded by the persecution of the Protestants in France by the Catholics, of the treatment pursued in England and Ireland by the former towards the latter. It is a curious illustration of the slow rate at which the world travels towards real wisdom and consistency, that in this very Declaration of the Rights of Man all allusion to religious liberty was forgotten. It does not seem to have occurred to the proposers of this famous Declaration of equality. The exclusion of Protestants and Jews appeared quite natural and a thing of course. The habits of oppressing and being oppressed are contracted like any others; injustice after

some centuries is considered as a right, and even those that suffer by it often finish by believing in its legitimacy. Mirabeau exclaimed on one occasion in the Constituent Assembly, "I hear constant allusion to the 'dominant religion.' I do not understand these words, and I must beg an explanation. Is it an 'oppressive religion' that is intended by it I would wish to know?" Raband St. Etienne for the second time, in a speech of remarkable ability, demanded "liberty, just and impartial liberty," for every religion; but his motion was rejected by a large majority.

The same arguments seem to have been used against the admission of the Jews to political rights by the Frenchmen of those days, that are now used by their English opponents. They were a nation and not a sect. They form an *imperium in imperio*. They have a country which is not ours, laws different from our laws, customs different from our customs, and other like fallacies.

The second great revolutionary tribunal makes a step in advance, and emancipates both Protestants and Jews. One would now suppose that liberty of conscience, thus acknowledged, had really commenced her auspicious reign; but, alas! it was only for a brief period. The principle was admitted in theory, but it had not yet been incorporated with public opinion. Hitherto, one religious sect had persecuted the other; now all religious sects whatever were persecuted, and the Convention forbade not only all public worship, but even the public use of all symbols of immortality. All funerals were required to be conducted in a form laid down by the Convention, and over the gate of the cemeteries the words, "Death is a perpetual sleep," were ordered to be written, and no minister of religion was allowed to assist at the ceremony of interment. This most intolerable tyranny over men's minds did not last long. No people can exist without religion, and so Robespierre found. A reaction came; and Robespierre attempted to found a new religion, which would have equally violated the principle of religious liberty, by again establishing a privileged worship. The Convention did not yet understand that perfect religious freedom can only exist with a complete equality of sects. This was at last acknowledged in the Constitution of 1795, the 354th article of which ran as follows: "No one can be hindered in the exercise of his religion, provided he conform to the law of the State. No one can be forced to contribute to the expenses of any form of worship. The Republic pays none whatever." Under the Consulate, the Roman Catholic Church gained her former ascendancy by reason of the number of her adherents, but all sects were paid by the State and considered equal before the law. Napoleon, when made Emperor, had more than one reason for favouring the Roman Church, and under the Restoration she was re-established as the State religion. In the Revolution of 1830, the words "State religion" were expunged, and the "religion of the majo-

city" substituted, and all sects were continued in the enjoyment of their rights. The Constitution of 1852 made no alteration in the position of the churches, and still maintained the liberty of religious worship. Still M. Simon considers that "liberty of conscience" is not complete in France, because the permission of the Government is required before any new sect can be formed, or before any one dare introduce into the country a religion already existing abroad. Apropos of the probability of a new religion arising or a new sect claiming admittance into France, he mentions that "at this moment the writings of Channing, popularized by M. Laboulaye, create on all sides partizans of Unitarianism."

M. Simon has been hitherto principally occupied with France; in his third lecture he takes an interesting view of the history of religion in other parts of Europe. He warns his hearers to beware of falling asleep in a false security, and, because the progress towards a recognition by the laws of France and Belgium of liberty of conscience has been steady hitherto, and because it appears to their minds so necessary and so evident, to forget that it is but a conquest of yesterday, upon which its enemies will soon lay violent hands if its friends are not always watching and ready to defend it. Intolerance abounds in every state of Europe; and those who would fain re-introduce it into Belgium and France, do not lack encouragement nor examples in other countries. We must never say that "Liberty is indestructible. By repeating these words too often, and by believing them too implicitly, many a people has fallen into slavery." Of the three religions that divide Europe at the present moment, there is not one that does not suffer from intolerance. M. Simon proceeds to review the condition of the Roman Catholic Church in Russia. The cruelties practised there to drive the people to profess the faith of the State Church, the Russo-Greek, are only paralleled by the persecutions of the Protestants under Louis the Fourteenth. The conversions from the Roman and even the Ruthenian Church not proceeding sufficiently fast to please the late Emperor, in the year 1838 soldiers were sent to hasten them.

"On coming away from the mass, the peasants found their villages full of troops. A Pope of the Russo-Greek Church ascended a stone and announced that the holy synod had *consented* to receive these strayed sheep into her bosom. It was necessary at once to submit, at whatever cost, upon this simple declaration. When the Czar has spoken, the conscience must be silent. If one of these poor creatures hesitated, he was immediately laid upon the ground, stripped and bastinadoed. He was generally converted before the twentieth blow. At Starosiel, the peasants with one accord declared they must first obey God and afterwards the Emperor. This was a case of rebellion. The soldiers fell upon them with sticks and swords. The frightened people took refuge on a frozen lake, when, the ice breaking, twenty-two immediately perished; the

rest struggled to the shore and prayed for mercy. They renounced their faith to save their lives. These savage scenes occurred in 1838."

The persecutions of the Roman Catholics in Poland are equally heartrending, and take the most painful forms in ukases relative to mixed marriages, the education and care of children, and other matters bearing on the happiness of social life.

"Doubtless," says M. Simon, "the Catholics among us who protest against the liberty of conscience, do not require that philosophers and heretics should be deprived of their worldly goods, thrown into prison and driven into exile, beaten by soldiers, separated from their children, cut in pieces, or thrown into the water. Persecution has never begun by these violent acts. But the principle of intolerance makes rapid strides. When accepting it to-day, you may be a fanatic only; to-morrow those who follow you will be shedders of blood."

We must add the interesting note that accompanies this excellent observation :

"In the first trial of Penn, the Quaker patriarch, the judge, irritated by the sang froid of the prisoner, exclaimed, 'I never before could understand how the Spaniards ever suffered the establishment of the Inquisition; but now I see clearly enough that we shall never be at peace in England until we have something of the same sort.' Whoever attempts to suppress liberty of conscience, finishes some day or other by wishing for the Spanish Inquisition."

From Russia M. Simon passes to England, and reviews the position of the Roman Catholics in Ireland before and after the Emancipation Act of 1829, and observes that, notwithstanding the improvement of their position, they are still far from enjoying perfect liberty, and mentions the employments from which they are still excluded, and the invidious distinction of the oath they are made to take on entering Parliament. "Such liberty is not properly liberty. Those who possess a liberty so special and restrained, appear less to use an undoubted right than enjoy a favour." He mentions other instances of intolerance towards Catholics in England, such as the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill, and the opposition to the Maynooth Grant. "The fact is," he says, "the Established Church is not only supreme in law, she is supreme also in public opinion, and as a Church she is intolerant."

The scene now changes, and from Russo-Greek and Protestant states persecuting Roman Catholics, we are introduced to Roman Catholic states persecuting Protestants.

"What an argument for liberty of conscience! Is it possible that in crossing the Channel one becomes either persecutor or persecuted according to the shore on which one lands? Can it be that an assembly nominated for the purpose of voting the budget and controlling the police, presumes to issue theological decisions and pronounce for ever the deprivation of rights of citizenship against all whose minds and consciences refuse to acknowledge their doctrines?"

The cases of the Madiai and the Count Guicciardini are mentioned, and lest an excuse should be found for them in the peculiar circumstances of Italy, in the contiguity of the seat of the Pope's government, and the still paramount influence of laws on religion, made in the darkness of the middle ages, in countries beyond the Alps, he reminds his hearers of the recent Austrian Concordat, of those also of Tuscany and Modena and of Spain,

"— now returned, it is true, to absolutism, but liberal and democratic only a few weeks since, when she inscribed the principle of a State Church, which is the essence of intolerance, at the head of the most liberal of constitutions. O most inconsistent men, who of their own accord forbid themselves the liberty to think, and are afterwards astonished that they should fall into slavery!"

The Jews next occupy M. Simon's attention, and he gives a painful account not only of their past persecutions, but of their present lamentable condition in most European states.

"England excludes them from her Parliament; Germany from all public employments; Bohemia and Bavaria refuse them the right of possessing land as well as the most sacred rights of family; Spain and Russia expel them from their territory; and yet we are astonished, when reading the history of India, to find its people still persisting in the prejudice of caste!"

Hitherto we have had a history of the persecution of liberty of opinion; in the fourth and last lecture our author vindicates, with great force and eloquence, the right of man to possess this liberty. The sanctity of the conscience, the necessity of free thought to a healthy action both of the individual and the state, are ably defended. In liberty of conscience he includes liberty of thought, liberty of worship, liberty of teaching, and the right of every man to use this triple liberty without suffering any diminution of his dignity either as a citizen or private individual.

"The liberty of thought is the foundation of all other liberties and cannot be infringed without impiety. It belongs to every man by an imprescriptible right, and must be purchased at the expense of any civil or political rights."

And yet how far is mankind from possessing this imprescriptible right! Even where he has it by the law of the land, how little is it respected by the law of usage and public opinion! Free before the law, it still requires a brave man to be free before society, even in liberty-boasting England. The following passage from our author's concluding pages will suggest some painful yet necessary reflections:

"The conquests of revolution still remain on the revolutionary field of battle; but all around it intolerance rears its head, fanaticism regains its power; war against liberty, against free thought, against reason, still continues. One kingdom is founded upon the Catholic Church. It passes a law to oppress those who cannot humble their reason at the

foot of the Pope. Another is established upon the doctrine of Luther. It obliges the intellects of all its subjects, by its constitution, to yield obedience to the authority of Luther. The cities of Germany, the cantons of Switzerland, are divided among hundreds of sects, and each one, directly it is established on a few leagues of territory, begins to proscribe all others. No one is permitted to profess Protestantism at Naples or in Spain; it is a painful trial to confess Catholicism in Sweden and Poland; a Jew at Rome, in Bohemia and in Bavaria, is treated like a slave. Behold the liberty of the 19th century!"

This indeed is a gloomy picture, but M. Simon finds some consolation and hope in the party of progress scattered all over the world, and mentions several circumstances in the recent acts of the rulers of Europe, and in the public expressions of feeling of several of its people, which shew that intolerance belongs to an age that is past,—that what we see is only its ruins, already crumbling, and destined at last to yield to the vigorous assaults of the increasing number of the friends of liberty.

"Agreeable as it is to find myself," he says, in an eloquent passage at the close of these admirable lectures, "in the midst of a society of choice spirits with whom I sympathize in thought and feeling,—what would I not give to be able to make my voice heard by the workmen, the ignorant and the poor,—to be able to make them feel what a holy thing is liberty,—to make them understand the imprescriptible rights of conscience and of reason,—to extend to them those truths which regenerate the intellect and inflame the heart, and which are for the soul what the light of the sun is for the eyes of the body. O God of Peace and Liberty! bless our efforts in thine own great cause! O may all who hear me and who inspire me become the apostles of liberty of conscience! May they be ever faithful to its voice, honour it by an invincible moderation, and ever remember that to be oneself worthy of liberty, it is above everything necessary to respect its exercise even by those who hate and curse it!"

Every reader of the *Christian Reformer*, we feel sure, will say Amen! to these noble aspirations, and feel himself encouraged by them to continue the good fight in which the Unitarian church stands pre-eminently in front, and alone among Protestant sects acts up to the great principles of the Reformation, the right of private judgment and liberty of conscience.

We have purposely abstained from giving anything further than an outline of M. Simon's book, and reserve all comments beyond a general verdict of approbation for another opportunity. There are some thoughts in it which we should like to develop, and some conclusions suggested by it which we should like to apply to the controversies of our own church, particularly that distinction M. Simon so insists upon between a religion and a philosophy. We should suggest to the consideration of our friends who are anxious for a new name for our body, whether in discarding the old one we do not appear to be dwindling into a "school" and ceasing to be a "church." Even now a vene-

rable and respected Prelate of the Established Church generally alludes to us as "a sect of religious philosophers." In our zeal for comprehension we must take care we do not lose our "authority" as a branch of the true vine.

Liberty of conscience should find its ablest defence in the authority of the Christian church; and the right of private judgment in all its consequences, with the inculpability of intellectual error, are alone associated with that branch of it called Unitarian. That name is essentially allied with freedom in every form, while grounded on an authority "which it did not make."

If "*La Liberté de Conscience*" should appear in a translation, we trust its legitimate influence will not be marred by the qualifying notes of an orthodox commentator, as is the case with the English version of "*La Religion Naturelle*."

ROBT. H—.

A MINISTER'S RETROSPECT.

CHAPTER VI.

MY FIRST CONGREGATION. *

IN a very young minister, anything like a professional ostentation of the pastoral office is in evil taste. He must be content to be, not to seem; and he will presently be known for what he really is.

It was my misfortune to look even more juvenile than I really was; and perhaps to feel more so; for I was uncomfortably shy and timid. It came to my ears one day that an ancient dame who occasionally attended the chapel had commented upon my boyish appearance, not simply to my personal disparagement, but to that of the congregation and the good cause itself. Lifting up her hands in amazement as she left the place, the old woman had said: "Bless us! what is ye Presbyterians about, to have a lad the like of he to preach to ye?" To disarm as far as practicable such invidious comments, or at least to anticipate surprise at being pointed out or introduced by my friends as the Presbyterian minister of A, I always thenceforth dressed intirely in black, and scrupulously wore a white cravat, not on Sundays only, but every day; though a smart young surgeon of my acquaintance assured me that the latter did not at all become me, and though my slender purse made me grudge the extra threepence a week in washing-bills, and enviously compare the cost of black trowsers and grey. Whether the last-mentioned garment, or the coat perhaps, may have been at one time conspicuously threadbare, I do not undertake to say, but I was astonished one day by the arrival at my lodgings of a piece of

good West-of-England broadcloth, with a note indited in Quaker phrase, expressive of a quiet approval amounting almost to admiration of "friend Benjamin's character and exertions in aid of Christian piety and virtue," and requesting my acceptance of the inclosed from "Thy friend." I never could make out who my friend was,—nor indeed did I set vigorously about it, as it was plain that he delicately wished not to be recognized; but I strongly suspected a good Quaker tailor near my chapel, with whom I never exchanged a word till many years afterwards.

This scrupulous regard to the black cloth and white cravat, I believe I may conscientiously say, was the only piece of affectation I was ever guilty of in my life. *Esse quam videri* was my real maxim of conduct; and I was soon old enough to discard this over-scrupulous attention to the latter. Indeed, I can say with truth that, having never attempted to pass for anything but what I really was, I do not think I have ever been materially over nor under estimated by my fellow-men in general, in the judgments which they have thought it worth while, or found it inevitable, to form of me. If they have erred, it has been in excess, not disparagement. They have generously let character stand for talent, and good efforts in the place of genius. It is to the honour of human nature that I record this; for it affords no unction to personal vanity.

On recalling in long retrospect this early period, I feel that I was, for so young a man, prematurely grave, even as a minister. I still believe it was good for my work and usefulness at the time; but I have often since doubted whether it was good for myself in the long run. I was made early serious and careful by family anxieties, and by my sense of responsibility as a minister. And there was also a class of people in the congregation, whose simple earnestness of religious character, while partaking a little of the ascetic, interested me greatly and appealed to this side of my character for sympathy. These were the General Baptists (Unitarians in belief), whose own congregation had lately discontinued its separate meetings for worship, most of its members joining us. These people were all serious and religious-minded, with not a little of the Methodist feeling and deportment, saying grace before breakfast and tea as well as before dinner, and doing sundry other strange but not irrational things of that kind. I would not have shocked even their religious prejudices too rudely, had I been fonder of frolic and fun than I was. But it was no great self-denial to me to abstain from play-going and amusements of a similar order. I now believe that a little more light-heartedness and *abandon* would have been healthier for myself. Happily I gained it later in life; and with it I gained an increase of working power and breadth of real sympathy with human life and human character.

The congregation at A included members of the most varied

classes of society, from the highest to the lowest. In my predecessor's time the former class had been much more numerous; but his crude and rough equality doctrines, which came out of his French sympathy and which occasioned his resignation, had been made the occasion by several of the wealthier families for conforming to the Established Church. As these families had already driven their carriages to the Meeting-house for three generations, the proverb which turns the horses' heads to the Church was merely waiting for an occasion of fulfilling itself when this foolish escapade of the Dissenting minister supplied it. I have often since had occasion to observe with what exemplary meekness and patience some of the very same persons (and persons of their order in general) can endure the extremity of folly and bad taste, as well as dulness and presumption, from the authorized parish clergyman or his half-educated and upstart curate. They shall come home, Sunday after Sunday, boiling with indignation at some arrant piece of Calvinism, or political absolutism, or (more lately) of scarcely disguised Popery, which has been inflicted upon them in the hour of divine service; yet they will go and endure this again and again in the name of the Church established by Act of Parliament, or in the higher names of Fashion and Respectability,—when a single foolish sermon could drive them from the Dissenting chapel which their forefathers had frequented from the days of the Act of Toleration. “The wish was father to the thought,” or these families would not have conformed on so poor a plea as this. At least they might, had they chosen, have come back and taken part in the election of a new minister, and have done their part to redeem their ancestral faith from the gratuitous charge of French Republicanism. But *vestigia nulla retrorsum* to those who have found their way from Chapel to Church.

Still the congregation retained the best men of that class. There were two brothers of high character and large wealth, on whom even Episcopal orthodoxy could not venture to frown contempt. James, the elder brother, was scientific, especially in the department of mechanical science. Richard was an admirer and patron of the fine arts. Both were men of considerable public spirit, munificent contributors to every educational or charitable object, high-principled Whigs of a very liberal school, a little inclining (by anticipation) towards the Radical, while holding in profoundest respect all the historical landmarks of constitutional English freedom. They were firm rather than zealous Dissenters, and (like many of their day) they dissented from Church and State as then allied rather than from the Thirty-nine Articles. Not that either of them believed the latter;—nothing of the kind;—but their religious, manly and English feelings revolted yet more from the indignity and profaneness of the Sacramental test then in full force. The Corporation of the

town having repeatedly sounded the elder brother as to his disposition to accept an aldermanic gown, he always told them plainly that they must first go to Parliament for the repeal of the ban under which he was placed as a Dissenter, for he would never comply with the test. Richard was known to share the same conviction, and was never, I believe, asked the question till after the repeal of the Test Act, when he became Mayor of A.

I experienced every kind of gentlemanly courtesy and personal attention from these brothers and their families. Their charming houses, with their noble libraries and valuable scientific and artistic stores, were freely opened to my use. I was a frequent guest at their tables, where I met men of celebrity of all kinds, and presently forgot my natural shyness and bookish awkwardness in the intelligent interest which, amid all possible luxuries of house and table, was still the characteristic element of those meetings. The old Dissenting gentry of that day were distinguished by this habit of bringing together all that was most active and stirring in literature, science or politics. It is their less exclusive characteristic now, simply because others have learnt to appreciate the enjoyment it affords.

More palpable kindnesses towards myself were not wanting, especially on the part of Richard, who had a princely heart of his own, and a way of doing substantial kindnesses without exciting any severe sense of obligation. I sometimes thought it might have been better if this sort of munificence had taken another shape in the stated augmentation of the minister's very slender salary; for, in truth, the contributions of the brothers to the maintenance of public worship seemed scarcely proportionate to their other public gifts. But this was their way; and whether the best way or not, it demonstrated a personal regard for myself with which I could not but be pleased, and it never laid me under a painful or servile sense of obligation. Servility to such men was indeed impossible, so far as *they* were concerned, even if their minister had had it in him. Still, I am convinced, the other plan is the truer one for a minister's independence, comfort and real usefulness; namely, to let the largest individual generosity reach him indirectly and collectively in conjunction with the contributions of the whole congregation, as part of his stated stipend; and to let personal presents or compliments be few, or at any rate not large in money value.

These and other elders of the congregation represented its hereditary Presbyterian element. There was one old gentleman, exquisitely neat in person, who wore powder and pigtail, and was always polite to me, while somewhat formal, and really kind. There was a considerable number of substantial farmers, some living on their own estates, and others tenants on the same land from generation to generation, whose ancestors from the time of

the Revolution had belonged to this society. The diminution of this class in our town societies for many years past is, I conceive, simply owing to the multiplication of places of worship of various kinds in their nearer neighbourhood. At the time I speak of, many came from three, four, five or six miles off, and in most cases there was no church nor chapel of any kind much nearer to them. Now there is a district church, or a Methodist or Independent chapel, within half a mile of most such farm-houses. There were also in the congregation a number of substantial tradesmen of similar descent from good Puritan ancestry. All these classes were firmly attached to civil and religious liberty, though they might not all be very clear-headed and discriminating theologians.

A curious illustration, by the bye, occurred in my early ministry, of the natural self-exaggeration of particular classes and occupations. I received a letter from one who signed himself "A Farmer," and no doubt was so, but who did not give his name, expressing great interest and general satisfaction in my ministry (with a fine, honest patronizing air about it too), and only regretting that I did not in my public services give that degree of prominence to the agricultural interest to which he thought its importance intitled it. Is not farming at the basis of the country's prosperity? asked my correspondent. Is it not the foundation even of human subsistence? Or who depends upon Providence more than the farmer for his crops? He had lately been to Bristol, he said, and in a Methodist chapel (to which he had gone with his relations) he had heard so much said about the sailors "who go down to the sea in ships and do business upon the great waters," that it struck him, if they were so important in a sea-port, the farmers were just as important in a market-town and neighbourhood. He begged me therefore to consider whether I ought not to put up a prayer in chapel every Sunday for the agricultural interest in general and farmers in particular, "who cast seed into the ground, and the seed springeth and groweth up they know not how." He hoped I should take this hint kindly, as a young man from an elder who had, of course, had more experience. The farmers were certainly the most important class in the community, as might be seen by there being so many Corn-laws passed one after another; and he thought they should be prayed for every where, as the sailors were in the sea-ports.

My correspondent being anonymous (indeed I did not at all know to which scion of the agricultural mind to ascribe the letter, unless to a farmer who sent his boy to my school), I could not explain to him my reasons for adopting a more general and comprehensive style of prayer for "all orders and degrees of men among us," but was content to act upon the wider principles of

good-will and devotion, and trust that this course of procedure would eventually approve itself to this good man's feelings among the rest.

Among the younger and newer congregational families, including some active tradesmen and a few artisans and other workmen, the Unitarian element was already active. That my predecessor had preached Unitarian theology in connection with his French democratic politics, was not indeed to the immediate advantage of the former. I found, however, that, through the exercise of such discretion as a young man possessed, my freedom of thought and "liberty of prophesying" were as large as I could desire. For, as I never believed that doctrinal truth was the sum and substance of Christianity, so neither could I derive the great duties, comforts or hopes of the gospel from any but the simple Unitarian view of its doctrines. In fact, the old Presbyterianism, in its negation of orthodox doctrines, passed insensibly into an active Unitarianism. It was Christianity without the special doctrines of Calvin; and Christian doctrine, though in such circumstances it might sit silent for a while under orthodox terrorism, was sure to speak its own native voice presently. In due time we had occasional courses of doctrinal lectures on subjects specially announced for specified evenings, with a view at once to set important truths clearly before our own young people's minds, and to interest religious inquirers beyond our own society; and these lectures, I trust, tended to shew that the real controversy in the hands of the Unitarians is waged on behalf of Christian righteousness and against the suggestions of alleged salvation by dogma, mystery or ceremony.

The old chapel was curious and interesting in its venerable simplicity. It is so still, I am told, as it still resists both the decay of time and the rising demand for Gothic churches. It is a massive square building, like many of its date, with heavy doors and window-frames, the latter filled with small diamond panes of glass leaded together. The pews are high-backed, dismally so, unless they have been levelled, as I fancy some one told me they have been. The front of the building was almost overgrown with luxuriant ivy; the roof supported by four thick stone pillars. Over the main gallery are the arms of King William the Third, with the date 1691,—a graceful expression of the loyalty of the founders to that "glorious deliverer" whose reign enabled them to build. I have seen the same emblem in two or three other places of the same period. My democratic predecessor had proposed to pull it down as unworthy of any but a congregation of absolutists; but the better traditions of the place had prevailed in the minds of the people, and so it remained, and I hope still does,—a somewhat uncommon emblem, it must be admitted, for a Dissenting place of worship. Yet I do not know why Queen Victoria's arms should not be mounted in

Unitarian chapels built since the passing of the Dissenters' Chapels Act; and, as those places are chiefly Gothic, even the look of the thing would not strike the eye as incongruous,—though, to be sure, for that very reason it might give the mistaken impression that the building belonged to the Church of England. To prevent all doubt on that head, there should be an accompanying reference to the Chapels Act, either in graceful Latin and flowery old English characters as at Kenilworth, or, better perhaps, in plain English words and plain Roman letters.

MYSTERY.

O THERE is Mystery all around !
 It hovers in the air ;
 It trembles in the wave of light
 That moveth everywhere.
 It hangeth on the wings of eve,
 In cloudy plumage drest,
 And sleepeth meekly when the eye
 Is closed in silent rest.

There is Mystery in all things !
 It hovers in the storm ;
 It girts the cloud when balancing
 And changing of its form ;
 It flieth with his shadow vast,
 Quick sweeping o'er the plain ;
 It sparkles in the stars of dew,
 And globes itself in rain.

It is in every element !
 It hovers on the sea ;
 Behold how deep the vast Profound !
 How like Eternity !
 It lingers on the mountains wild
 Alone, alone, alone !
 It speaks among the solitudes,
 And in the winds' low moan.

There is Mystery all around !
 In the tender buds of life
 That break amidst the vernal air
 In fragrant, voiceless strife ;
 And woven in the forms of Spring,
 It breathes upon the flower ;
 It murmurs in the Autumn wind,
 It whispers in the bower.

Mystery.

There is Mystery deep within !
 The beating of the heart,—
The movement of a single thought,
 Its substance and its art.
It hovers on the deeps of Love,
 All shadowy and bright ;
And darkening on the brow of Hate,
 Portends the stormful night.
'Tis in the blush of woman's face,
 The glowing of her eye,
And mingles in all perfect grace
 As twilight in the sky.

There is Mystery far away !
 Creation in its dawn !
Egypt and her mysteries—
 Her Nile, her Memnon song.
Our genesis is Mystery :
 What law decrees the sex ?
How was this temple garnished ?
 And *what* the skill that decks ?
There is Mystery us before !
 Who can tell his morrow ?
Who divine his heights of bliss ?
 Who his depths of sorrow ?
It hovers o'er the sea of death,
 Nor ceases as we die ;
Its wings wave o'er the endless life,
 Unseen by mortal eye.

In all things liveth Mystery !
 In atoms and in worlds ;
It glorifies the universe,
 And Time in all his whirls.
We know not : thence comes space for hope ;
 Thence beauty filleth all ;
Thence nature and the ages move
 As fairies in their hall.
We think at times upon the soul,
 Its reason and its love,
Its longings for the undefined,
 Its lower and above :
We would *arrest* its shadows all,
 And dive into its deeps ;
But Vision ends in Mystery—
 She Nature's counsel keeps.

E. G. H.

MR. GEORGE LONG ON THE CONDITION AND PROSPECTS OF
ENGLISH UNITARIANISM.*Queen Anne Street, June 9, 1857.*

MY DEAR SIR,

HAVING concluded all that it occurred to me to say respecting Mr. Tayler's letters, I now proceed to redeem a pledge in my first letter, by "an investigation of the causes why Unitarianism has hitherto made so little progress," and to make some "observations on its present state, and anticipations of what may be expected hereafter."

The situation of the early Unitarian ministers in the Presbyterian connection was peculiarly discouraging. They had to open the minds of their hearers, who had been trained in widely different, and indeed hostile principles, to the admission of what they thought far juster views of Christianity. This could only be done by slow degrees. The minister could not declare at once the whole counsel of God. He had much to say that his auditors could not bear; and it required the nicest exercise of Christian prudence to adopt the best course of instruction under such circumstances. It appears, indeed, from the well-known four Sermons of Lardner, that he, at least, had the boldness to preach Unitarianism in unequivocal terms. This, however, was but the infancy of Unitarianism, and it was not a recognized sect till the time of Priestley and Lindsey.

When Unitarianism began to be acknowledged as a section of the Christian church, it had to look for support to two classes,—the Presbyterian Dissenters, to whom may be added the General Baptists, and the Church of England. Several clergymen followed the example of Mr. Lindsey by resigning their preferments; and many persons of the Established Church, among whom were included several highly esteemed and respected members of the University of Cambridge, embraced Unitarian sentiments. The accession, however, from the Church fell greatly short of expectation; but among the Presbyterians, Unitarianism became by degrees nearly universal; and that sect at length was more known by the name Unitarian than by the term which it had originally adopted, but which was in truth a misnomer. But for the disputes which originated in Lady Hewley's case, it seems probable that the word Presbyterian would have been altogether disused.

It is very difficult to form a fair estimate of the effect of the writings of Dr. Priestley on the progress of Unitarianism. He was, in many respects, deserving of respect, esteem and admiration. He was truly pious and benevolent, and his moral character was without a stain. His energy was unconquerable, his industry unremitting, and his literary and scientific acquirements were perhaps unequalled by any one of the age in which he

lived. With the sincerest desire to promote the cause of truth, religious, political and scientific, his time was fully occupied in pursuing scientific investigations, advancing the boundaries of science by his discoveries, supporting what he believed to be sound political principles, and, above all, in endeavouring to free religion from what he thought corruptions, and to advance and extend its influence in the world. His labours in behalf of Unitarianism were far more abundant than those of any of his predecessors or contemporaries. His controversial writings, which are numerous, are distinguished by great talent, by a sincere love of truth, and are not disgraced by the virulence which generally accompanies religious controversy. But notwithstanding all this, on looking back on the career of Priestley we shall find much in his writings which could not fail to operate injuriously to the cause which he had so deeply at heart. The productions of his pen are far more addressed to the head than to the heart. That he was sincerely pious himself, cannot be doubted; but his works are not, in general, calculated strongly to excite devotional feeling. His sermon on Habitual Devotion may be selected as a devotional composition equal to any of his writings, and it deserves to be mentioned with great praise; but still it is very inferior in warmth of feeling to many parts of Hartley's *Rule of Life*, from which it is derived, and to Mrs. Barbauld's beautiful poem to which it gave occasion. There is a familiar style in his writings on religion offensive to many; and the language in which he speaks of our Saviour is such as is not warranted by the writings of the apostles and the evangelists. But a greater fault than these is to be ascribed to Dr. Priestley, —the mixing up of Unitarianism with very questionable philosophical views of an unpopular character, and which gave great offence to many serious and religious persons, and indisposed them to the reception of his religious opinions. I will not here enter on the perplexing question of the determination of the human will, lest I should be in the condition of the very evil company mentioned by Milton, who

“— found no end in wandering mazes lost.”

It will be sufficient to refer to the doctrine of Materialism, strongly enforced by Priestley, and which, in the opinion of many, leads, by a short but conclusive argument, to atheism. His uniting Materialism and Unitarianism has done incalculable mischief, and is perhaps the principal cause of the strong feeling of dislike of Unitarianism which still prevails very extensively, and of the extreme ignorance of the opinions which the Unitarians profess which is to be found in a very large portion of the educated classes in this country.

On the departure of Priestley for America, Mr. Belsham became the leading defender of the Unitarian doctrine, and

continued to hold that station for many years. Many persons attended the chapel in Essex Street for the purpose of hearing him defend Unitarianism, which circumstance probably occasioned his preaching to assume a very controversial character. Many of his published sermons, indeed, of a practical nature, are distinguished by much that is excellent; but there is little, even in the best, of a character to excite strong religious emotions, and to carry on the great, difficult and all-important work of spiritualizing the mind and the heart. Belsham held, in common with Priestley, the doctrine of materialism, and I believe never renounced it, although some observations which fell from him in his latter days seem hardly consistent with it.

The publication of what is called an Improved Version of the New Testament is an important era in the history of Unitarianism. Few, probably, at this time will deny that on the whole that publication has operated injuriously. As Mr. Belsham took the leading part in this work, it is always associated with his name. Why the editors chose to make Archbishop Newcome's Translation the basis of their own, instead of adopting the Received Version, has never been satisfactorily explained. The language of the Common Version is so beautiful, and it is so enshrined in the religious feelings and associations of the whole community, as to make any unnecessary departure from it highly inexpedient. But besides this great error, many others marked the Improved Version. The printing of the first two chapters of St. Matthew's Gospel, and the first two chapters of St. Luke's, in the italic character, as of doubtful authority, gave offence to many; and the arguments against the authenticity of the chapters in Luke were severely handled by Dr. Carpenter, and shewn to rest on no sound foundation. Another great error in the Improved Version is explaining the Word in the first chapter of St. John's Gospel to mean a person, and translating the third clause of the first verse, "and the Word was *a* God," utterly at variance with the uniform language of both the Old and the New Testament, which apply Godhead to the Father alone, and in direct opposition to the best Unitarian expositors. I see no reason to think that in the New Testament the Word has any other meaning than what it bears in the Old. "By the word of the Lord," says the Psalmist (Psalm xxxiii. 6), "were the heavens made; and all the hosts of them by the breath of his mouth." No reasonable man understands the word and the breath to mean a person. What can their meaning be but that the heavens and the earth were created by the power and wisdom of God? Surely the beginning of the Gospel of John may be best explained as an expression of the manifestation of the Divine perfections in Jesus Christ. I am not aware that any one now agrees in the explanation of this remarkable passage of Scripture in the Improved Version.

Many of the notes in this Version are highly objectionable, being written in a party spirit and with a most unjustifiable dogmatism. The observations made on that work by Vice-Chancellor Shadwell in the Hewley case were unfair and uncandid; but if the editors had been more cautious and more humble, occasion would not have been given for the scandal.

The prominent part taken by the Unitarians in politics, at the period of the great French revolution, whether right or wrong, certainly tended to make them unpopular with a great majority of the people. Burke, in his speech on a motion for leave to bring in a Bill to repeal certain Acts respecting religious opinions, in the House of Commons, on May 11, 1792,* treats the Unitarians as a political party; and no doubt a large majority of his hearers concurred in the same views. It is much to be regretted that the favourable feelings of the Unitarians towards the French extended so far as to make a large proportion of them the apologists of that emanation of selfishness and ambition, Napoleon Bonaparte. Those who are old enough to remember the publication of the earlier volumes of the *Monthly Repository*, will have seen ample proofs of this predilection.

The circumstance of the Unitarians occupying a much higher position in society than other Dissenters, has very much tended to prevent an increase of numbers in their body. The almost invariable consequence of the acquisition of a large fortune in England is the purchase of an estate and the establishment of a family in the country; and great and inestimable are the benefits which we derive from this practice. It operates, however, very unfavourably to Unitarianism. Often a Unitarian family settles in a part of the country too far from any Unitarian place of worship to enable them to attend it. They have therefore generally to elect either to attend the service of the Church, or to neglect public worship altogether. Few serious Unitarians, probably, would not prefer the former alternative, particularly as the afternoon service of the Church does not put forward what are called orthodox doctrines so prominently as strongly to outrage the feelings of Unitarians; differing in that respect very widely from the morning service. Nothing can be more desirable than the cordial co-operation of the squire of the parish with the clergyman in all parochial affairs. The wants, physical, intellectual and moral, of the poor are to be attended to, and schools, and sometimes other institutions for their benefit, are to be established and supported. The conscientious performance of his duties must bring the Unitarian gentleman in contact perpetually with the clergyman. Being near neighbours, they will naturally form habits of intimacy with each other, and the younger branches of both families will probably become attached

* Works, Vol. X. p. 41.

friends. The Unitarian family may generally have family connections and friendships with those of their own persuasion, and will occasionally, in visits to London or to towns where there are Unitarian congregations, have opportunities of attending their worship; but these, being only occasional, can hardly be expected to efface the constantly repeated impressions made in their own home and neighbourhood. The Unitarian country gentleman, too, will probably become a magistrate for his county, and will associate chiefly with persons in his own position. As very few of this class, however, are Unitarians, this association cannot fail, in ordinary cases, to weaken his attachment to the religious body to which he belongs.

Two other circumstances of the times in which we live seem to operate very unfavourably on Unitarianism. We are a *reading* age beyond all former example, and the consequence is a vastly increased number of authors. The art of literary composition has been greatly extended; and it is quite within compass to say that there are at this moment a hundred living authors (I think I might safely double the number) who are far better writers than any in the age of Addison or Johnson, with perhaps half-a-dozen exceptions. To supply the literary wants of the age, there has been a largely increased number of periodical publications, reviews, magazines, &c. The great and deserved success of Boswell's *Life of Johnson* has given a new character to biography; and scarcely an individual who has in any considerable degree attracted the attention of the world is gathered to his fathers, but speedily two or three octavo volumes, sometimes more, make their appearance, containing all that is known, and much that is conjectured, of the life of the defunct; and, not unfrequently, prefixing memoirs of his ancestors. Now in reviews and magazines a certain space must be filled in each number, and in biography the purpose seems to be to make the work as long as possible. These publications, therefore, are in general written in a verbose and cumbrous style, very distressing to those whose literary taste has been formed by a familiar acquaintance with the best writers of their own country, or of Greece, Rome, Italy or France. The novelists, too, a host in number, and many of them of great talent, for the most part indulge in the same exuberance of language. Philosophy and theology are also guilty of the like reckless extravagance in the use of words. The attention which the German writers on these most important subjects have received here has added another element of deterioration of style. Nothing seems to be avoided so much, by no small number of authors of the present day, as simplicity and perspicuity of style. Long, perplexed and obscure sentences, expressed in words remote from ordinary use, and to which the uninitiated find it impossible to affix any distinct ideas, mark the productions of those writers. It was untruly said by

Johnson, that shallows are always clear. It is to be feared that many readers and perhaps some writers of our own day have fallen into the lamentable error of thinking that muddiness is always deep. It is, however, quite certain that an author may be very obscure and not at all profound. Nearly all our most profound and comprehensive thinkers have given their thoughts to the public in language clear and distinct. Bacon, though not without the faults peculiar to his age, is never misled by his fine imagination to indulge in unintelligible flights, but is always easy to be understood. Hobbes' works are models of philosophical style. Locke, without any beauty of language, is, except in his strange chapter on Power, always clear and distinct. Berkeley, the most acute of our metaphysicians, is surpassed in perspicuity and beauty of style by no writer in the language. Hume's style is clear as crystal; and Burke, with unrivalled eloquence, great depth and largeness of thought,—deteriorated, alas! by violence of sentiment, and disfigured by frequent violations of good taste,—is never obscure. It is a great mistake to think that because the subjects treated of are in themselves obscure, the language used in discussing them must be so also. Those who understand what they are writing about may always express themselves clearly, however intricate and abstruse the subject may be. The mighty mystery of our own being,—the relation of mind to body,—all our intellectual operations,—the great question of what is (not very philosophically) called free-will,—the action of gravitation,—time and space,—and the perfection and attributes of the Deity,—are capable of being treated, and often have been treated, clearly and perspicuously. That strange jumble of contradictions, the Athanasian Creed, is expressed in clear and unambiguous language. To think deeply is an endowment of superior minds; but it is no difficult matter to express our sentiments in such obscure and perplexed terms as will be considered by the multitude proofs of profound thought. The greater part of what passed for philosophy was for many ages chiefly made up of unintelligible jargon, and many of the speculations of our own times are of the like character. But what has all this to do with Unitarianism? A great deal. Unitarianism is the core and centre of Christianity. It is what all believe, but which what is called orthodoxy has surrounded and incrustated with what we think pernicious errors. All believe that God sent Jesus Christ into the world to save sinners, and that his life, his teachings, his miracles, his death and his resurrection, were all essential parts of the great scheme for the redemption of the human race from sin and the awful consequences of sin. All believe that his apostles had authority to preach his religion. Now this is Unitarianism, and all other doctrines are additions to it, believed by those who hold them, but rejected by us. According to our view, the doctrines of Christianity are plain and simple, such as

all can understand; and consequently they ought to be taught without being mixed up with "things obscure and subtle." Let philosophers, if they be so minded, discuss the most obscure subjects, but let them beware of depriving the common Christian of the bread of life, while they are pursuing their lofty speculations.

The language in which Unitarians have often expressed themselves respecting Christ, especially in what may be called the middle period,—for neither the older nor the later Unitarians are chargeable with it in any great degree,—is greatly wanting in the reverence with which he should always be mentioned. It grates on my ear when I hear Jesus called a prophet. He himself said that the Baptist was a prophet, and more than a prophet. When I call to mind the language of the New Testament, that the Word was made flesh in Jesus; that to him the spirit was given without measure; and that in him the fulness of the God-head dwelleth bodily; and when I find Jesus saying, "If a man love me, he will keep my words, and my Father will love him, and *we* will come unto him, and will make our abode with him,"—language which would be blasphemous if spoken by the greatest of the prophets;—I cannot for a moment hesitate in ascribing to him a union with the Father which has never belonged to any other. I see no objection to the use of the word Divinity applied to Jesus, provided it be clearly understood not to mean Deity, which is uniformly ascribed in the New Testament to the Father only.

Many modern writers have indicated, although perhaps no one has unequivocally asserted, that one gospel was preached by the original disciples and another by St. Paul. This notion, totally unfounded as it appears to me, would, if admitted, be destructive of all rational belief in the truth of Christianity. That the Almighty should put one apostle in opposition to all the rest, is so incredible, that no one seems to have been bold enough distinctly to assert it.

Free Inquiry is the idol worshiped by many in the present day; and the view they take of it appears inconsistent not only with Unitarianism, but with any fixed belief whatever. We are to be always inquiring, and to come to no conclusion. These writers seem to adopt the language of the satirist, and to act

As if religion were intended
For nothing else but to be mended.

No one can prize free inquiry too highly when it is founded on the proper principle; that is, the duty which we owe to our Creator to make the best use in our power of the rational and moral faculties which he has given us; but when it is considered merely as a privilege, and pursued without a deep, conscientious sense of duty, it is more likely to be injurious than beneficial. Far to be preferred is the condition of him who believes "all that the nurse and all the priest has taught," to him who pursues

free inquiry from self-will, and not from a sense of religious obligation. Free inquiry is only valuable for its results; and unless it lead to some satisfactory conclusions in which the mind can rest, it is totally useless.

We have hitherto looked to the unfavourable side of our subject: let us now inquire whether there may not be found some circumstances in our present condition favourable to our hopes and expectations for the future. The period when Unitarianism began to be recognized as a section of the Christian church was far more favourable to a rational investigation of the evidences and the doctrines of Christianity than the times in which we live; but it was certainly unfavourable to the spirituality of religion, and to the cultivation of a devotional spirit. It was said long ago that Unitarianism is the Arctic zone of Christianity. Such a censure would not have been thrown upon us unless we had given some occasion for it. With few exceptions, among whom may be named Cappe and Carpenter, the writings of Unitarians of the last and the early part of the present century are not distinguished by a devotional character. At length a bright and glowing light sprang up in the Western hemisphere. The works of Channing are an era of unspeakable importance in the history of Unitarianism. With the purest and most spiritual conceptions of the Creator, he unites an exalted opinion of human nature, and of its capacity to pursue indefinitely the career of virtue and holiness. An unfortunate remark of Dr. Channing, "I am but little of a Unitarian," has, in some degree, operated injuriously to the Unitarians. Taken literally, the assertion has no meaning; for a man must be or not be a Unitarian; and there is no middle state. A fair interpreter of the sentence might have easily seen that it intended to express the partial agreement of Channing with sentiments commonly held by Unitarians, but not essential to Unitarianism; and in this view of the subject no doubt many may be found to agree with him, both in America and in this country. The highest privilege of man is to address himself in prayer, thanksgiving and praise, to the Great Author of his being. It is the bounden duty of every man to direct his prayers to his Maker with the deepest devotional feeling, and with a complete abstraction from all extraneous circumstances. If, then, it be conceded, and I fear it cannot be denied, that there is an apparent listlessness and want of interest in offering our prayers to God in our religious assemblies, we must acknowledge it to be a grievous fault. Unitarians, and I fear the larger part of the Christian church in general, feel their chief interest in attending to sermons; and the prayers, by far the most important part of religious service, are comparatively little regarded. Finding much in the writings of modern Unitarians to which I cannot assent, I gladly notice in them a spiritual character and a devotional spirit, which I hope and be-

lieve will lead to an advance of spirituality and devotion among us. Never for a moment should we lose sight of our blessed Saviour's words, "God is a Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth."

Unitarianism is in so depressed a state as to lead to an apprehension that it may dwindle almost to nothing. If it should be so, I see enough in the present state of public sentiment and feeling to anticipate its future revival and triumph, probably in a more spiritual shape. The best educated, the most intelligent and the most rational of the lay members of the Church of England are, I fully believe, entirely emancipated from those doctrines of the Church which are the most strongly opposed to the views of Christianity entertained by Unitarians; and they agree, in many important particulars, far more nearly with them than with the Church to which they belong. The same state of opinion I have been told exists among the Independents; but as I have scarcely any personal acquaintance with that body, I am not in a condition to form an opinion upon it. The circumstance above mentioned, and the divisions existing in the Established Church, seem to point to some great change at no great distance of time. I have no doubt that the energetic exertions of the intelligent laymen of the Established Church would do more to advance a reformation in religion than the combined action of all classes of Dissenters. I trust that a second Reformation is preparing, to which the first will be as the earliest dawn to the full light of day. Let us all, according to our powers and opportunities, do our best to advance that unspeakably great and glorious event.

I am, dear Sir, yours sincerely,

GEORGE LONG.

HOW AN AMENDED TRANSLATION OF THE BIBLE IS TO BE OBTAINED.

THE Convocation did not make the present English Bible, and it does not require a Convocation to mend it. The present excellent and most valuable—though far from faultless—edition of the English Bible was received and accepted by the Church of England without any ecclesiastical authority or sanction whatsoever; and it requires no ecclesiastical sanction to authorize the reception of an amended edition, should it be prepared, as our present edition was, by a body of Commissioners, nominated by the Crown, and acting under its authority. Having paid attention to the indications of public opinion on this question, I am prepared to give it as my decided opinion, that such an edition, so prepared, would be received with thanks to Almighty God, who had put the thing into the heart of the Queen, and with gratitude also to Her Majesty, by every Protestant Church in the United Kingdom.—*Rev. J. Scott Porter's Three Lectures on Bible Revision.*

ODE TO THE ANCIENT CITY OF CHESTER.

BY THE REV. S. F. MACDONALD, OF CHESTER.

UPON the banks of Deva,
 The ancient Celtic stream,
 A grey old city standeth,
 Of centuries the dream ;
 Of centuries the relic,
 Of former days the pride,
 When Saxon churl and Norman earl
 Did England's strength divide.

Engirt with walls it riseth
 Above the plain around,
 By tower and bridge defended,
 By castle, moat and mound ;
 E'en now those time-worn ramparts
 Its fame and power attest,
 When erst the land it did command,
 And sentinel'd the west !

But ah ! how many changes
 Have these old walls beheld,—
 How many a victor vanquished,
 How many a queller quelled !
 What tides of population
 Have rolled around this spot,—
 Have spent in strife their little life,
 And been at length forgot !

What scenes of ancient glory,
 What tales of iron war,
 Could these grey rocks unfold us,
 And hills that stand afar !
 Like surging waves of ocean
 That sweep successive on,
 That tower on high, then sink and die,
 Those men of old have gone.

Here lived the painted savage
 With gems and baubles gilt ;
 His raft first spanned yon river,
 He first those bulwarks built.
 Here marched the Roman soldier
 In kingly power and pride,
 With mail'd breast, and eagle crest,
 That owned no power beside.

Here trod the sturdy Saxon,
 The jovial and the free ;

Here rushed the Danish Viking,
The master of the sea ;
Here charged the steel-clad Norman,
The artful and the strong,
Whose only right was mettled might,
Yet triumphed in the wrong.

Here ruled the princely Lupus
Beneath his kinsman's fame ;
Here came the warlike Edward,
The Welchman's pride to tame ;
And sad, unhappy Richard,
A crownless prisoner led ;
And Henry mild, whose reign reviled
Saw blood like water shed.

And once upon this tower
The royal Stuart stood,
While fierce on yonder moorland
The tide of battle flowed :
The iron men of Cromwell
His cavaliers bore down ;
And Langdale sped and Litchfield bled
In vain for England's crown.

Yet o'er the ancient city .
The royal standard waved,
And long her sons undaunted
Fire, steel and famine braved.
Too faithful for the faithless,
Too loyal for her lord,
To want and woe, and not the foe,
She yielded up the sword.

We greet thee, noble Chester,
We greet thy kingly men,
As from the mists of story
Once more they rise again.
Thy time-scathed walls we honour,
Thy crumbling towers revere,
Thy sacred aisles, thy hoary piles,
That bring the distant near !

Long be thy dwellings joyous,
And bright thy household fires ;
Thy children brave and loyal,
And worthy as their sires !
Long may thy sons be nurtured
In noble arts of peace,
In faith and truth, best gifts of youth,
And still those gifts increase !

SIR EDWIN SANDYS.*

WE have been led by Sir Edwin Sandys' connection with an American colony to anticipate in our narrative some events of his life. Postponing for the present all reference to his literary works, we return to his career in Parliament.

The struggle for liberty on the part of the Commons, and prerogative on the part of the Crown, which began in earnest in the reign of James the First, brought into frequent exercise the talents for debate and for drawing up State documents which Sir Edwin Sandys in a remarkable degree possessed. In conferences between the two Houses, he was not unfrequently the representative of the Commons. Thus, in the year 1607, he was the bearer of a message to the Lords on the subject of the wrongs inflicted by the Spaniards on British subjects. In 1610, he took part in a conference of the two Houses on the subject of monopolies and other impositions, by which the King was wringing money from his unwilling subjects. The temper of the Lower House was little pleasing to the King, and he suddenly dissolved Parliament. It did not meet again till 1614, when Sir Edwin Sandys, failing in an address to his county, found a seat as representative for the borough of Rochester. The abuse of customs at the outposts, levied without the authority of an Act of Parliament, was vigorously assailed; Sir Henry Wotton feebly asserted the prerogative of the King as an hereditary (as distinguished from an elective) Sovereign to levy impositions; he was promptly answered by Sandys, and the House by an unanimous vote denied the asserted right of the King. Again the Parliament was abruptly dismissed. The King now tried the arts of intimidation. Several of the members were summoned by pursuivants to give before the Privy Council an account of their speeches in Parliament. Some were sent to prison; others were rebuked, and their Parliamentary notes and papers relating to the debate on impositions were burnt. Mr. Hallam speaks in his *Constitutional History* (Vol. I. p. 495) of Sir Edwin Sandys as being imprisoned at this time; but on this point that accurate writer is in error, as will sufficiently appear from a letter of Rev. Thos. Lorkin to Sir Thos. Puckering (*Court and Times of James I.*, p. 324), dated June 18, 1614: "This day, after the Parliament was dissolved, such as had been the most offensive and scandalous were convened before the Council, and four committed to the Tower, viz. Sir Christopher Neville, my Lord Abergavenny's second son, Sir Walter Chute, Hoskins of the Temple, and Wentworth of Lincoln's Inn, lawyers. The particulars of their offence I dare not adventure to write, neither do I judge it fit. The first and last of these are likely by degrees to recover their liberty, as having transgressed in an

* Continued from p. 416.

inferior degree unto the other two, who shall continue by it. *Sir Roger Owen, Sir Edwin Sandys and Sir John Saville, Knight for Yorkshire, were also in some danger; but they gave so good an interpretation of their own meaning as they were presently dismissed.*"

In the Parliament of 1621, Sir Edwin Sandys was elected for Sandwich. Some intimidation seems to have been cast in his way, for the news-letters of the day speak of his not attending for several days on the opening of Parliament through fear of consequences. But he was appointed to act on some important committees, and immediately took his seat and pursued his usual patriotic course. It was this Parliament which struck at some of the great delinquents of that most corrupt age, and associated by damning proofs the name of Bacon (in other respects so honoured) with the receipt of bribes in payment of judicial corruption. In the proceedings against some of the other State criminals selected by Parliament as examples of popular indignation, Sir Edwin Sandys took an active part. In a debate towards the close of the session, some words of his gave great offence to the Court, and his liberty seems to have been threatened. What followed is somewhat obscurely related in the Commons Journals.

"Misunderstanding of Members' Speeches.

Sabbati, 2^o Jan. 19^o Jacobi.

"*Sir William Earle.* That the King hath given us liberty of speech. Because some tax hath been made upon Sir Edwin Sandys his speech, to have him condemned or cleared by question in this House.

"*Sir Edwin Sandys.* Heareth that some words of his have been misconstrued, and that out of the House. 1. That he wished the evening after the conference with the Lords — That he cried 'Rise, rise!' which he did desiring passion may be avoided, and not speak till next morning, that passion were over. That speaking suddenly and passionately, out of sorrow, he said, 'Monopolies had eat up trade, and monopolies maintained by corruption.' Hath heard of divers corruptions in matters of monopoly which will manifest at our next meeting. This he hath heard partly in this House and partly from the Lord's House. That for the second speech against which exception, that he should slander H. M.'s Government by saying, the whole Government of the Commonwealth was out of frame; that he spoke this only of matters of trade and money, as might (appear) by the particular application of want of money; that he heretofore observed that no complaint had been made against the judges of the common law, so that the government of the courts of justice by him commended; that by the word 'palliating' he intended '*falsis bonis nascuntur vera mala.*'

"Upon question, Sir Edwin Sandys free from any just cause of offence to H. M. or any other by the particular words now related by him, or by any other words he hath spoken in this House, without one negative." *Journal of House of Commons*, I. 635, 636.

Before prorogation, the House passed a hasty declaration,

amidst unusual expressions and signs of passionate feeling, that they would spend their lives and fortunes for the defence of their own religion and the Palatinate. An incident is recorded as happening at the close of these proceedings, which illustrates the excited state of the Commons. Sir Edward Coke fell on his knees, and with extraordinary emphasis and many tears recited from the Book of Common Prayer the collect for the King and Royal Family.

No sooner was Parliament prorogued than the King gratified his violent but impotent malice by questioning and imprisoning some of the patriotic leaders of both Houses. Sir Edwin Sandys shared this *intended* disgrace, but actual distinction, with Sir Edward Coke,* the Earl of Southampton and John Selden. Sandys and the illustrious man last named (against whom the King had on a previous occasion manifested his jealousy and dislike) were committed to the care of the sheriffs. Sandys's gaoler was Sheriff Allen; Selden's, Sheriff Ducie. Their treatment was liberal, except that they were forbidden the society of their friends and the use of books. In the case of Selden, his keeper broke the injunction by allowing him to have two MS. works, the *Alexiad* of Anna Comnena and Eadmer's *History*. The accomplished prisoner found solace by translating the former into Latin, and preparing the latter for publication. The studies of both prisoners were ransacked for proofs of crime, which the Government eagerly desired to possess. One of the persons who executed the warrant for searching Sandys's papers was Matthias Fowlis, who had been in the previous session of Parliament dispossessed of a patent for gold and silver thread, and imprisoned in the Fleet for delinquencies committed in the pretended exercise of his patent. Exasperation would ensure a diligent search: accordingly he first rifled the contents of the prisoner's study, and then demanded from his lady her keys, that he might search her cabinet and boxes. This high-minded woman—fit partner of an English patriot—instantly gave them into his hands, bearing this testimony to her husband's good faith,—that “she wished his Majesty had a key to unlock her husband's heart, that his Majesty might see there was not any thing therein but loyalty.” A commission, consisting of Buckingham, Arundel, Cranfield and Secretary Calvert, was appointed to examine Sandys and the others. How grossly the commissioners infringed on the lawful liberties of Englishmen in the course they adopted in their examination, is evidenced by the questions put to Sir Edwin Sandys, which are fortunately pre-

* Coke, now atoning by his patriotism for his unworthy servility as the King's Attorney-General, had a few months before been imprisoned in Newgate. His dungeon had at one time been a kitchen, and some wag inscribed over the door a punning reference to the prisoner's name—“This room has long wanted a Cook.”

served in the Harl. MSS. in the British Museum, No. 161. They are, we believe, now for the first time printed entire.

"The two first Examinations of Sr Edwyn Sands.

"1. What conference hee had att any tyme and with whom* touching a petition to bee made to the Kinge by the Parliamente for the long continuance thereof after his Majesty had signified to the Howses his purpose of dissolving thereof, and where he dynded that day the message was broughte.

"2. What conference hee had and with whom, either by word, message or writinge, concerning a charge offered by the Kinge to the Howses by the mouth of the Lo. Treasurer, whether they would have a cessation of yt by selectinge some few Bills to be passed such as his Majesty should like of, or an adjournment to some other tyme.

"3. What conference hee had and with which of the Lordes att any tyme in the Committee chamber of the Higher Howse.

"4. What conference hee had and with whom touching a benevolence to be given to the Lady Elizabeth.

"5. What conference hee had with the Baron Done att any tyme, and in what places and to what purpose.

"6. What conference hee had att any tyme concerning the matche with Spaine, and with whom hee had discourse thereof as hee remembreth.

"Upon all these pointes he was examined every day, and these two followinge were added the two last daies :

"1. Upon a letter founde in his closett from one Mr. Brewer,† living att Amsterdam, hee was demaunded when he had received yt, what answer he had made to yt, and of his correspondence with the Brownists.

"2. Upon a meditacion founde in his closett begunne to be penned by him touchinge the power of God, something was therein spoken of the kings of th' earth, judges, magistrates, masters of families, and of their power and righte, which he was willed to explain."

The imprisonment of the popular leaders in Parliament raised deep anxiety in the minds of those who watched the struggle going on between Liberty and Prerogative, particularly in the city of London. Fortunately, the King was as timid as he was rash. To allay popular feeling, a proclamation was put out, declaring that Sir Edwin Sandys was not restrained on account of his service in Parliament, but for other personal matters.‡

* In G. W. Johnson's *Life of Selden*, it is said that the leaders of the Opposition were accustomed to meet sometimes at the lodgings of Pym, in Gray's Inn Lane, sometimes at the house of Selden; and that knowing themselves to be objects of suspicion, they resorted to the place of rendezvous in disguises.

† Brewer is mentioned in letters written by Sir Dudley Carleton from the Hague, in 1619, to Secretary Naunton, as an object of suspicion to the Government, as being associated with Brewster (afterwards one of the Pilgrim Fathers) in printing Puritan pamphlets and other obnoxious books which were sent to England. Brewer is described as setting Brewster to work, as being a man of means, and bearing the charge of his printing. Brewer was imprisoned in 1619, and his press and type and papers seized. This was at Leyden. He did not join the Pilgrims, and may have removed to Amsterdam, whence he wrote to Sandys.

‡ Letter of Mead in the *Birch Papers*. Court and Times of James the First, II. 264.

This did not produce the desired effect, and the King dropped the struggle by releasing the prisoners, after they had been detained in custody rather more than a month. Their liberation was the occasion of a popular "jubilee"* in the city. The Royal assertion that Parliamentary proceedings had nothing to do with Sandys's detention, though afterwards emphatically repeated by the King, was not believed at the time, and will not now count as a feather's weight in the scale against the calm declaration of Selden, who says in his *Vindiciæ Maris Clausi*, "*I was committed to custody for certain Parliamentary matters, with some leading statesmen who were lovers of the prerogative of the Sovereign as well as of the true liberty of their country, not because I had acted rashly, but because I had mingled with them as a counsellor (for as yet I was not one among the members of Parliament).*"

When, in the following November, James was compelled by the exigencies of the State to call his Parliament together, the Commons resented with no little warmth the invasion on the personal liberty of their members. Sir Edwin Sandys was prevented by illness from taking his seat; his brother, Sir Samuel, declined to give any information as to the cause of his arrest. Many members expressed their anxious determination to uphold the privileges of the House, attacked in the person of Sir Edwin Sandys. Two members of the House were ordered to go to him, and ascertain from him the cause of his imprisonment, and to bring from him a written declaration on the subject. The required narrative was produced to the House by Sir Peter Hayman, and was immediately ordered to be burnt by him. This was doubtless done as a matter of precaution, as both private papers and public documents were made matters of accusation, and even the Journals of the House were inspected and tampered with by the King. In the same spirit, a few years after, this same Sir Peter Hayman obtained an order from the House that the Clerk of the Journals should set no man's name to the motion he made. Alarmed by the determined spirit manifested by the Commons, the King adopted the unusual course of writing a letter to the Speaker, forbidding the members to presume henceforth to meddle with any thing concerning his government or deep matters of state. On the matter of Sir Edwin Sandys's imprisonment, he thus wrote, deliberately repeating the discredited statement of his proclamation: "And whereas we hear they have sent a message to Sir Edwin Sandys, to know the reasons of his late restraint, you shall in our name resolve them, *that it was not for any misdemeanor of his in Parliament*; but to put them out of doubt of any question of that nature that may arise among them hereafter, you shall resolve

* Letter of Mead. Court and Times of James the First, II. 268; and Chamberlain's letter, p. 269.

them in our name, that we think ourselves very free and able to punish any man's misdemeanors in Parliament, as well during their sitting as after, which we mean not to spare hereafter, upon any occasion of any man's insolent behaviour there that shall be ministered unto us." The King concluded his letter by denying the propriety of calling their privileges an undoubted right and inheritance, and asserting that their sole foundation was the grace and permission of his ancestors and himself. Thus challenged, the Commons could not decline the struggle with the King. They entered upon it wisely and firmly. On the very day that Sir Edwin Sandys's communication was read and burnt, viz. Dec. 18, 1621, they agreed upon a solemn protest, in which, among other constitutional doctrines, they assert as the ancient and undoubted birthright and inheritance of Englishmen, the privileges of Parliament, the freedom of speech of its members, and their immunity from impeachment, imprisonment and molestation, for what they say in Parliament. The King, foiled at every point by the courage and wisdom of Parliament, had only the sorry revenge of sending to the Clerk of Parliament to produce the Journal, and of tearing before his Council with his own hand the Commons' Protestation. This done, he dissolved the Parliament, and once more threw into prison Coke and other leaders of the patriotic party. There was another mode of punishment adopted by the King, in which the sufferer, in addition to injury, had to bear the insult of a pretended honour. Obnoxious patriots were sent as royal commissioners to Ireland, and were there lost to public life, buried in the midst of a people scarcely redeemed from savagery. Coke and Sandys both had the equivocal honour thrust upon them of a commission to inquire into the state of churches in Ireland. They were now aged men, and a mission to Ireland was, if not a sentence of death, certainly one of banishment. But it is believed that neither of them was compelled to go: for Coke, the Prince (Charles) is said to have pleaded with his father, urging the cruelty of sending away a man of three-score and fourteen years.

Sandys was, at the general election of 1624, returned for Kent, the freeholders of that county, in grateful acknowledgment of his services and patriotic sufferings, conferring upon him, unsolicited and in his absence, an honour to which at an earlier period he had in vain aspired. Sir Edward Coke was returned by the constituencies of several boroughs, amongst which were Windsor and Coventry.

It was in this Parliament that extortion and peculation were laid to the charge of the Earl of Middlesex. There was poetical justice in the fact that the members to whom the drawing up of the charge against this corrupt Minister was entrusted, were the Lord Cavendish, Sir Edwin Sandys and Mr. Nicholas Ferrar. They had, when he was Sir James Cranfield, and they were

pleading for their rights in the matter of the Virginia patent, felt the oppression and extortion of which he was capable. Mr. Hallam especially commends the cautious, temperate, but effectual, course pursued by Sandys in this impeachment of Middlesex, who was convicted by an unanimous vote of the Peers, and sentenced to a fine of £50,000, imprisonment during pleasure, and banishment for life from Parliament. The historian whom we have just quoted, a very high authority on a constitutional point, declares that this impeachment of Middlesex "was of the highest moment to the Commons, as it restored for ever that salutary constitutional right which the single precedent of Lord Bacon might have been insufficient to establish against the Ministers of the Crown." (*Const. Hist.* I. 508.)

And here the enumeration of Sir Edwin Sandys's public services may be closed. James died soon after the fall of Middlesex, and with the struggle that ensued in the reign of Charles, Sir Edwin had little or no share. Enough has been adduced to prove (and the task has never before been attempted in any detail) that Sir Edwin Sandys was an upright, consistent and fearless patriot,—one of those English worthies in the reign of James of whom Arthur Wilson speaks as "jewels that should be preserved and kept in the cabinet of every man's memory, being ornaments for posterity to put on."

Of his private life little is known; but the personal friend of Selden, Southampton (Shakespeare's patron), Cavendish and Ferrar, must have been in no common degree an estimable man. He died in 1629, leaving behind him many children and a widow, whom he appointed the executrix of his will (which bears date Aug. 25, 1629). In it he charges her to regard his friend Nicholas Ferrar as her adviser in all important affairs. There is still preserved in the church of Little Gidding, in Huntingdonshire, the gift of Nicholas Ferrar, a silver flagon bearing this inscription:

"WHAT SR EDWYN SANDYS BEQUEATHED
TO
THE REMEMBRANCE OF FREINDSHIP,
HIS FREINDE HATH CONSECRATED
TO
THE HONOUR OF GOD'S SERVICE.
1629."

Sir Edwin Sandys was buried in a vault under the south transept of Northborne church. He had during his lifetime erected a sumptuous monument in the church. On the tomb are the effigies of a recumbent knight in armour and of a lady in a loose mantle. The space left for a monumental record never received the intended inscription. On this fact Halsted, the historian of Kent, grounds this ill-natured remark: "He who erected this sumptuous monument, and added the provisional tablet of escutcheons on it, with the thought of securing to himself and his

posterity a kind of immortality, left not behind him of all his numerous children one who had the least veneration for him or respect for his memory, both the tablet and escutcheons remaining a blank at this time." (Halsted's Kent, fol., IV. 153.) Postponed at first because his lady survived him, it might afterwards be neglected through the troubles of the times. His sons appear to have paid the true respect to a father of carrying his principles into action, and fought on the side of liberty against prerogative. His second son and namesake, Col. Edwin Sandys, served in the Parliamentary ranks under the Earl of Essex, and received his death-wound in 1642 at the battle of Worcester. Before he died he put out, in reply to some false statements respecting him circulated by the Royalist party, that not ambition had led him to take up arms, but "a legitimate and ardent desire of advancing that cause which honours the meanest of them that are employed therein,—the maintenance of true religion, the honour and security of his Prince, the rights and privileges of the Parliament and the whole kingdom." The words of this dying patriot were ordered to be printed* by the House of Commons, Saturday, Oct. 16, 1642; and some of those who joined in that vote would remember that the father had struggled and suffered in the same righteous cause for which the son had given his life.

An account of Sir Edwin Sandys's admirable book, *Europæ Speculum*, will be given hereafter, and will close this short series of articles.

ON THE INFLUENCE OF DR. CHANNING'S WRITINGS AND LIFE IN FRANCE.

WE have at the present time many interesting proofs of the interest which is felt by the more cultivated portion of the French people in the writings of Dr. Channing. The last token of this feeling is found in a handsome octavo volume of 400 pages, entitled, "Channing, sa Vie et ses Œuvres," published in Paris by Didier and Co. It is the work of a countrywoman of our own, whose attention was drawn to the eagerness of the people of France to know something respecting Channing. M. de Laboulaye was the first to draw the attention of his countrymen to the subject. This he did in some articles in the *Journal des Débats*. He subsequently published two volumes, containing translations of some of Channing's works, which had a very favourable reception both in France and Belgium; were praised by M. Renan in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, by M. Leroy in the *Revue de*

* A copy of this extremely rare Declaration and Vindication is preserved in the Bodleian Library, *Pamphlets*, Vol. LIV.

Paris, by M. Pelletan in the *Siècle*; and in Belgium the volumes were recommended by the praise of M. Van Niemen.

The work so successfully achieved by M. Laboulaye prevented the completion by our accomplished countrywoman of her purpose of preparing for publication a translation into French of Channing's works; but she wisely determined to do her part by giving in a French dress a biography of the author whose writings had found such warm acceptance. She has taken as the basis of her work, which is now before us, the Biography by Rev. W. H. Channing, and has added translations from the letters of Dr. Channing, and from his sermons on Self-denial, on the Proofs of Christianity, and on Spiritual Liberty. It is a very interesting book—and, although it contains no new facts, would abundantly repay the labour of translation into the native tongue of the writer. The closing reflection will indicate the spirit of the volume:

"Thus died this good man, who was, even to his last hour, young in heart, young in enthusiasm, young in faith and hope. He has bequeathed to us more than his writings, more even than his memory; he has left us the sweet and noble assurance that a life consecrated entirely to God and Truth, that a life devoted throughout to what is great and beautiful, in the cultivation of inward purity and in love to our fellow-creatures, preserves within the soul an enduring youth and beauty. Admirable and consoling spectacle, which here below gives us assurance of the rank which God assigns us, and inspires the thought of an immortality!" Pp. 253, 254.

Not the least interesting portion of this volume is its Preface, which has been contributed by M. de Rémusat, whose historical and biographical writings, so widely circulated and renowned amongst his countrymen, ought before this time to have had an English translator.*

A writer in the Boston *Christian Examiner* has thus characterized him:—"M. Charles de Rémusat is one of the ablest of those remarkable men who continue to the French Academy its pre-eminent fame among the societies of the world, whose genius is not burthened by their vast erudition, and whose graceful writing makes even dry metaphysics clear and attractive. A lover of philosophy, he is as ready to deal with facts and to appreciate the claim and position of all the sects. Catholic in his own faith, he believes in sincere inquiry, has no rebuke for the idea of progress, and rejoices to recognize the worth of liberal thought and independent thinkers. The same acute enthusiasm which makes his biography of Abelard at once a criticism and a panegyric, gives worth and warmth to what he says of Lardner

* The titles of his principal works will shew how much M. de Rémusat is interested in the history and literature of England: "England in the Eighteenth Century;" "Saint Anselm of Canterbury;" "Abelard, his Life, Philosophy and Theology;" "Criticisms and Literary Studies;" "Bacon, his Life and Philosophy."

and Arnold and Channing. He is wholly free from that mean bigotry which would neglect a great religious movement because it has not gained the force of numbers, or would despise the labours or writings of noble men because they bear a hated name. He will not treat the works of Unitarians, according to the fashion of many, as if they were the 'productions of some successor of Martial or Petronius.' The men who have advocated the Unitarian faith make it respectable in his view, even if it had no other support."* With these introductory words of explanation, we now give a translation of M. de Rémusat's Preface to the new Life of Channing.

This work has been written in French by an English lady, who does not wish either that her name should be made public or that she should be the subject of praise. It is for the reader to appreciate for himself, and without our pretending to guide his judgment, both the sentiments and the talent of the pages that follow. Moreover, it would be difficult for us to speak fittingly of her who has written them.

The name of Channing is beginning to be known amongst us. Thanks to a skilful and earnest writer, we can already acquire for ourselves a correct idea of his life, of his character, of his opinions and of his talents.† A fresh narrative in greater detail, interspersed with new extracts, will render this idea still more complete, and will doubtless excite the desire of becoming acquainted with the entire works of the American pastor.

We observe every day a very general return to an interest in religious ideas. They whom this feeling of interest brings back to our churches, will not think it necessary to read Channing; his piety may please them, but his opinions will estrange them. But we ought never to forget that there exists a great number of intelligent and serious persons whom the teaching of our preachers does not altogether satisfy, and who nevertheless cannot rest content with a philosophical spiritualism, and really desire in some manner to re-unite themselves to Christian tradition. It is for these undecided and well-disposed persons, it is also for all those who cannot accept faith without carefully protecting all their liberty, that Channing appears to have written and spoken.

Even the indifferent may be touched by the sincerity and the earnestness of a mind pervaded, as his was, with the importance of heavenly things, even in respect to the things of earth. As he was evidently not influenced by any political motive, as no

* The article from which this quotation is taken, well worthy of a perusal, is entitled, "M. de Rémusat on Unitarians and Unitarianism," and is occasioned by his essay in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, on the "Religious Controversies in England."

† Œuvres Sociales de W. E. Channing, précédées d'une Introduction par M. Edouard Laboulaye, Membre de l'Institut.

exclusive regard to any institution known to us, animated him, he ought to find an easier access to the minds of those whom circumstances have made distrustful, and whom experience justifies in frequently associating a kind of religious zeal with the predominance of circumstances or parties. It is too true that the vicissitudes of the world exercise a powerful influence on the manner in which we regard even the things which are not of this world. Certain very natural fears or antipathies, though having some foundation, yet in no respect edifying,—certain purposes in no respect blameworthy, yet in no particular sacred, in reality enter largely into those of our convictions which profess to be purely Christian, and our thoughts of eternity are often only the ideas of our age. This in itself is perhaps not a great evil; but this possibly inevitable mixture of discordant ideas repels as many minds as it attracts, and involves a danger to which the church ought to give some little heed. Those of its ministers who set themselves to justify these prejudices, do it as great a wrong as its bitterest enemies.

To this kind of prejudice, as it seems to us, the *evangelical* instruction (he at least believes it to be such) of the minister of the Christian society of Boston cannot in any degree give birth; and hence he is able to assist in reconciling to Christianity a great number of those who have estranged themselves from it: he may induce them to make in this sense their first advance, though they should be afterwards forced to pass him by, and to re-enter (thanks to him) the bosom of a communion which would not be his own. They may find in his works either a definite faith, or an introduction to a faith. Minds are very different; they have wants more various than we imagine; and the unity which is so much the object of pursuit, exists often only in appearance. It would be a great thing indeed if amongst all Christians there existed the same heartfelt piety. Heartfelt piety! this in reality appears to us to be the characteristic merit of Channing. In order thoroughly to understand him, it is necessary that we should shake off those mental habits in which the traditions of an old society involve those even who pride themselves most on their independence. It is always a very difficult thing for us to regard as a spiritual director, as a minister of religion, one who only acts by certain preaching and writings. We are willing to look upon him as only an orator, as a very respectable writer; but we are not able in our thoughts to separate the nature of the mission with which he feels himself invested, from certain external forms and from a somewhat official authority, of which he ought to carry the sign and to exercise the functions. Nevertheless, as religion is strictly a moral power, a little more or a little less of outward show is of no consequence, if the mind is convinced, if the heart is changed. Now, in American society, in that especially of the Northern States,

worship is for the most part reduced to its simplest forms, and the sacred word has not on that account any diminution of power and influence. It is a country of a religion without a form of worship. Of thirteen States, that of Rhode Island is the least; but on this land blessed by Heaven, religion and liberty have from their very birth been united. Under the influence of the noble Harry Vane, certain pious men, who fled from the intolerance of the Puritans of Massachusetts, established an independent colony, whose existence and rights both the Parliament and the Monarchy at its restoration equally confirmed. A charter which it received from King Charles II., for once well directed by his sceptical indifference, proclaims, in terms truly admirable, certain principles which have not perhaps yet fully triumphed any where in the territory of this haughty Europe. Six years hence, two centuries will have elapsed since this little democracy, shunning anarchy as much as despotism, has peacefully enjoyed some of the greatest blessings which can be conferred on human society. It was there, in the town of Newport, that Channing was born, and that he imbibed with his growth those doctrines, at once Christian and liberal, which constitute both the support and dignity of man upon the earth. From this point he started, strong in the pure love of God and humanity, to exercise even in neighbouring States an empire of improvement and of instruction which is not easily comprehended in our European notions, and of which his works give us only an imperfect idea. It is necessary to place oneself, in imagination, in the midst of the society where his mission was accomplished, in order to measure its importance and utility; it is necessary to create, by supposition, around ourselves a purely moral state, in which institutions and conventional forms disappear, where intelligence, sentiment and freedom of will alone reign, and to exhibit in the simplicity of republican manners certain voluntary associations, bound together by the attraction of truth and feeling, around a man of their own choice, whom they freely accept as their counsellor and guide. This is nearly all the external religion that exists in most of the sects of North America, and we know that it is not on that account the less powerful over this most energetic of nations.

Books cannot produce very great effects, and those even of Channing will have done much if they only induce men to reflect. What depends on us is less belief than religious thought; it is in exciting and directing this that writers of a certain order are serviceable. The excessive activity of communities in our day, which are much more industrial than contemplative, leads them to indifference to all that is not material and practical. The flight of thought no longer is elevated; men scarcely have a thought of heaven; many of those who speak of it officially scarcely conceal their secret attachment to the interests of earth.

Power and success occupy too large a space in their thoughts, and by slow degrees the authority of the moral law escapes them; they do not suspect it, but they decline. We need to listen to voices more pure and disinterested; we seek them without saying so; we love to meet with souls entirely pervaded by a love of moral beauty, truth and holiness. We are improved by their example and by intercourse with them, without even following them in all particulars. It appears that such is the fruit which we gather from the work which we are now to read. Happy are they who are able to discover in their souls the sentiments which have dictated it!

CORRESPONDENCE.

RELIGIOUS WANTS IN THE UNITARIAN BODY.

SIR,

As one who hailed with thankfulness the publication of Mr. Tayler's third letter in your pages, I have eagerly read the correspondence which it has occasioned, and am prompted to address you because I think that in the discussion which has arisen upon the "Bond of Union" among Unitarians, and the "name" which they should assume, more immediately important matters have received too little notice.

It appears to me that the central idea in Mr. Tayler's letter was a recognition of the truth of the charge of "coldness," even amounting to religious death, so often brought against our church, and that he raised the question with the view of probing the depth of the consciousness of this in the body, and of turning our thoughts to the detection of our shortcomings. I regret, therefore, that in the correspondence which has taken place there appears a tendency to limit the discussion to the two above-named subjects, which would assuredly settle themselves in the most satisfactory manner, if by the discussion of the wider question we should succeed in kindling the fire or awakening the life which I confess I believe to be most lamentably wanting. I need say nothing in vindication of my belief; for have we not all, as Mr. Greg says, "grumbled it out by our firesides," in our meetings, and in every other possible way, for years past?

Has not this coldness arisen from the position of theological attack and defence which, at first a necessity of our position, has become an habitual mental attitude? We are a body of theologians, therefore the subtle essence of religious life has escaped us. We do not ordinarily look for the enduring organizations of political life to spring up in the midst of war, neither can we wisely expect religious life to spring from theological strife. Assuming that we form ourselves into churches for the purpose of cherishing and strengthening one another in the only impregnable bulwark against the assaults of the world, the flesh and

the devil, the services of those churches should be exclusively directed to that end, and every judicious means used to educe and strengthen religious feeling and emotion; the appeal should be to the heart chiefly, leaving all unsettled questions of the intellect for discussion in more fitting seasons. Let our preachers subordinate the office of Teacher to that of Prophet. Mr. Tayler, in his "Christian Aspects," has concisely expressed the difference for which I am contending: "It cannot be too often repeated that the influence of a Prophet must be distinguished from that of a Teacher. The Teacher labours to persuade by argument addressed to the reason, the Prophet demands submission by an appeal to convictions already within the breast."

The Unitarian pulpit appears to me to cultivate, almost exclusively, theology and morals; both sciences matters of the intellect chiefly, therefore cold to the great bulk of mankind, who are not reasoners; excellent foundation for religion, but not the thing itself. Theology is the attempt of men to express in terms of scientific accuracy what they know of God;—a work fraught with mighty consequences; but let us never forget that it is the attempt of beings finite by nature, with faculties miserably stunted by past errors of thought, endeavouring to express in formulas which must partake of all their imperfections, their conceptions of the nature, person and attributes of the Infinite God. Yet we rely upon the process as though *we* had attained absolute and final truth. I would not be understood to underrate truth, but merely to call in question the fact that Unitarians, or any human beings, have attained to such truth as will justify their characteristic self-glorifying tone in reference to the creeds of other churches. This tendency in our mode of thought recently found expression in the following manner, the speaker bearing a name deeply revered among us: "He anticipated mischief from this hunting after a grain of truth in a bushel of error, to shew what essential truth was to be found underlying every doctrinal error." Now I know of no tendency of thought in the present day which is more essentially Christian than the disposition to recognize truth even in the creeds of those who despitely use and persecute us.

Morals must also be regarded as, to a great extent, an intellectual work; the attempt of man to express in scientific form his duties towards his fellow-men. Such thoughts when embodied in sermons, such as form a great portion of our pulpit addresses, may not unjustly be called *mere* moral essays,—as I have heard them styled by those accustomed to more religious preaching, although diluted by a large admixture of intellectual error. Our moral discourses appeal chiefly to the intellect, whereas the field for Religion is the heart, and the office of her ministers to win to "submission by an appeal to convictions already within the breast." Religion, although founded upon theology (and the purer this theology the better), is a far higher region, wherein the soul may dwell free from the turmoil which surrounds and clogs us below. Read from the elevation of her courts, the teachings of morality become "the laws of God;" and those who from this elevation can address their brethren, in "wand'ring mazes" of theologies and moralities "lost," speak with words which find their way to our hearts at once, and we feel them to be as prophets "having authority."

It is an easier thing to point out deficiencies than to suggest remedies, and this is a case in which we must not look for any specific which shall

cure us in an instant. It must not be supposed that my foregoing observations have reference to our preachers alone. I believe that we are all alike in need of a new spirit, and, although conscious of this want, know not where to look for it. Mr. Tayler has indicated one direction in which we may seek, and as far as I have observed, no succeeding writer has touched upon the subject. Do we avail ourselves of all the means which are at our disposal to promote to the utmost the drawing out and fostering of devotional feeling in our weekly assemblies? I think not. We have in use Selections of Hymns which lag far behind the taste of those who use them; the great majority of which hymns have been altered to avoid some rock of false doctrine, which was the inspiring idea of the writer; and having got well rid of the corn, we feed upon the husks. We thus to a great extent miss the valuable aid of Poetry, than which I know of nothing better calculated to promote the object we have in view. When I have been present at the services of our brethren of the State Church, I have felt that there was something very beautiful and true there, which we with our purer theology miss almost entirely. With the strongest feeling of dislike to formalism, I have a conviction that a Liturgy, arranged somewhat after the model indicated, is eminently calculated to promote devotion. I do not here again suggest an imitation, with the errors left out, but the original work of the most gifted minds among us, who from the vantage-ground of a rational belief should be able to do much better. Throughout the region of religious thought we want boldness to grapple with the real living interests of to-day, and an end of fighting "dead Satans." Let all the light which science throws on the works and ways of God be brought to bear upon the interpretation of His word, as conveyed in the Bible, in His providence, and in the heart of man; break down the barrier of technical language and illustration, which has a great influence in *unrealizing* our religious thoughts; seek more aid from the cultivation of taste in music and poetry; and ceasing from the work of demolition and foundation-laying,—which we ought to have effected by this time, or we are bungling workmen,—let us commence the glorious work of erecting a temple for the *living* God, so beautiful that it shall gradually attract all men to it, and so large that it shall have room for all without loss of freedom; and if we then do not find we have an intelligible bond of union, I fear we never shall; and I believe that for a name, we shall all be content with calling ourselves Christians, let the world call us what it will.

I would suggest to Mr. Tayler, Mr. Greg, and others who feel strongly the necessity of change, to consider the practicability of inducing the Unitarian Association to organize an efficient plan by which our churches may be represented in an occasional Convention, for the purpose of discussing these subjects, and adopting such "recommendations" as may seem calculated for the general good. I think that the opportunity for comparison of ideas would be productive of much good, and promotive of efforts for the increased efficiency of our churches. In such a convention the Lay element should predominate in number, and every arrangement be adopted to promote its taking an active interest and prominent share in the proceedings.

SIDNEY PRICE.

ORDINATION AT BRISTOL.

SIR,

YOUR correspondent says, that "such a service has not been conducted since May 31, 1759, in connection with the Lewin's Mead congregation, when the Rev. Thomas Wright was appointed assistant minister to the Rev. W. Richards" (C. R., p. 444). I am in possession, however, of a pamphlet, entitled, "The Principles and Duty of Protestant Dissenters considered, in a Sermon preached at the Ordination of the Rev. John Prior Estlin at Lewin's Mead, Bristol, August 5, 1778, by the Rev. William Enfield, LL.D.; with an Address on the Design of Ordination, by the Rev. Thomas Wright; Mr. Estlin's Answers to the Questions proposed to him; and a Charge by the Rev. Nathaniel White. London and Bristol. 1778." 8vo, pp. 90.—It is somewhat singular that Mr. (afterwards Dr.) Estlin had been for seven years one of the stated ministers of the congregation before he was thus ordained (p. 35). He was pastor at Lewin's Mead, in conjunction with the Rev. T. Wright and the Rev. J. Rowe, from 1771 to 1817. Dr. Estlin's successors, till Mr. Jones, had all been ministers of other congregations before their settlement at Lewin's Mead. Cordially uniting in the good wishes of your correspondent, I am, Sir, very truly yours,

R. L. CARPENTER.

Halifax, July 2, 1857.

ARCHBISHOP LAUD.

BOOK after book issued from the press, * * * all condemning in no subdued terms the ecclesiastical and courtly conduct of the times. This expression of public opinion was rebellion in the eyes of Laud, and a decree of the Star Chamber, dated July 11th, 1637, strictly forbade, under the penalty of "fine, imprisonment, or other corporal punishment," the printing or vending of books so "seditious, schismatical and offensive, to the scandal of Religion, or the Church, or the Government, or governors of the Church or State, or Commonwealth, or of any corporation, or particular persons whatsoever." Strong and comprehensive terms these, the intent of which could be narrowed or extended to embrace almost any offence, or to justify almost any severity of punishment. In such phraseology Laud delighted, and, as we have seen, he observed on another occasion, he was delighted when "the true meaning was hid under the curtain," because he found such "of great use for the settling of the Church." That the Church of England was now approaching the Church of Rome was considered so apparent, that Lady Anne Cavendish spoke truth as well as satire when she thus told Dr. Laud her reason for becoming a Papist—"I hate to be in crowds, and as I observe your Grace and many others are hastening towards Rome, I determined to get there before you comfortably by myself."—*Johnson's Fairfax Correspondence*, I. 336, 337.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

A Manual of Religion and of the History of the Christian Church, for the Use of Upper Classes in Public Schools in Germany, and for all educated Men in general. By K. G. Bretschneider. Translated from the German. Pp. 296. London—Longmans.

THE name of the learned author of this work will be a sufficient assurance, to all who are acquainted with it, that the volume contains much valuable matter, stated with clearness, as well as with candour and devoutness of feeling. These great merits probably no one will deny. At the same time, the work has to our mind two very considerable faults. One of these is, that it attempts to go over so large a variety and extent of subject-matter in so brief a space, as will be seen from the following sketch. The author, while clearly expressing his recognition of the great fact of Divine Revelation, is yet anxious to place religion on a philosophical basis, and accordingly occupies Parts I. and II. of his work with the subject of Philosophical Theology. He endeavours to shew the origin, truth and authority of the idea of God, and some other kindred religious ideas, in and from the nature of the human mind. Having done this, after the method of the Kantian philosophy, the writer proceeds in Part III. to the subject of "the Education of the Human Race to Freedom by God, or on Divine Revelation;" and in Part IV. to "Revealed Theology." In these two Parts are comprised sketches of the contents of the Old and New Testaments, of the several periods of Divine Revelation, and of the characteristic ideas and doctrines of each period. When we add that the whole of the first two Parts is compressed into a space of less than eighty pages, and of the second two into little more than a hundred, the reader will perceive at once the brevity with which the various subjects must be treated. The remark is even more applicable to Parts V. and VI.; the former of which is on the subject of Salvation, and "the means towards it in the Christian Church;" and the latter on the History of the Christian Church from its foundation to the times succeeding the Reformation,—the whole of the two Parts occupying still less than the number of pages last mentioned. And yet it is but just to add, with all this rapidity and brevity of treatment, a great amount of information, clearly and systematically arranged, is communicated,—including many references to books and to illustrative facts. Thus the work forms, in truth, a very excellent sketch or outline of the whole department of religious knowledge; and whether the reader may agree or not with the philosophical portion, the historical parts will be found to contain a great deal that is instructive and suggestive to all thoughtful persons.

But a second fault of the work is simply in the circumstance that it is a translation from the German. To say nothing of the obscurity of some of the words and ideas to the English reader (for which the translator is sometimes to blame), we think that this Manual does not in other respects supply all that is required in such a work as this. The author's world is evidently a German one—his church, his Bible, the readers whom he addresses, are German too; while the kind of Manual required for use in the upper classes of schools, and by older persons of education in this country, should be one of predominantly English cha-

racter; one proceeding from a mind that is well acquainted with the advantages and the defects of ordinary English religious training, and which can, therefore, address itself directly to the great ends of religious instruction and impression which have to be attained. We think, in short, that an English author of the requisite experience and learning, united to deep religious feeling, is the person likely to give us the exact work that is wanted—or rather the series of works, for one would not be sufficient. But still let us express our gratitude to the translator for having done what he has towards filling up the void which, as he and many others feel, does really exist. On some parts of the subject, indeed, we have already far better books than this; e.g. in Mr. Higginson's two volumes on the Old and New Testament. On other parts we have as yet hardly anything, on the plan of this Manual, that is adapted to the modern state of knowledge and feeling on some very important topics of religious inquiry. Until, if ever, we obtain all that we need, the present work will serve as a highly useful guide in the hands of a competent teacher.

To these remarks we may add, that the author writes not only with simplicity and freedom, but in a moderate and liberal spirit as regards the various great divisions of the Christian world. His own doctrinal opinions do not prominently appear; and nearly all that he says on doctrinal subjects is so assimilated to the language of Scripture, that but few Protestant readers, we think, of any creed, will take offence, or find reason to dissent, in any great degree, from his statements.

As specimens of the substance and method of the volume, we append the two following extracts; the first, on the teaching of Christianity respecting God; the second, on the nature of Christ. From each passage we have omitted some of the notes.

“§ 223.

“Concerning the idea of God, Jesus and the apostles confirmed the doctrine of the earlier revelation (§§ 236, 242), especially that of the unity of the Divine Nature (John xvii. 3; 1 John v. 20; 1 Cor. viii. 5 sq.; Eph. iv. 6), but further taught that God is an invisible spiritual Being (*a*) and entirely perfect (*b*), possessing in himself his origin and counsel, and needing nothing out of himself, therefore the happiest (1 Tim. i. 11, vi. 15); upon which most consummate life the existence and life of the universe depends; also a Being of absolute innate goodness, from whom good only proceeds, and who only imposes affliction in order to better. But as through Jesus belief in God should become the property of all men, so (in opposition to the Mosaic law) Christianity lays particular stress upon the goodness of God, exhibiting him as Father to all men, watching over all people, not excepting the wicked, and willing that all should be brought to freedom and immortality through Jesus (*h*).

“(a) Rom. i. 20; Col. i. 15; 1 Tim. i. 17. The same, together with that expressed by the image of light, according to the Scriptures, the symbol of inner purity; 1 Tim. vi. 16; John iv. 24, *πνεῦμα ὁ θεός*. ‘A spirit’ (*πνεῦμα*) is therefore also ascribed to him which differs from any other, his Spirit (*πνεῦμα Θεοῦ*) or that called the ‘Holy’ Spirit: Luke iii. 21 sq.; Matt. iii. 16; John xv. 26; 1 Cor. ii. 10 sq.; Acts v. 2—4; 1 Cor. iii. 16; compare 2 Cor. vi. 16.

“(b) If this is not signified by *τέλειος* (perfect), Matt. v. 48, it is certainly signified by the word ‘alone’ frequently placed before the Divine attributes, as *μόνος ἀγαθός*, Matt. xix. 16; *μόνος ἀληθινός*, John v. 44; *μόνος σοφός*, Rom. xvi. 25, sq.; also 1 Tim. vi. 16.

“(h) 1 Tim. ii. 4; Titus ii. 11. He caused all to be called, including the Gentiles: Matt. xxii. 2—10; Luke xiv. 16—24; Matt. xxi. 33—43, viii. 11 sq.;

John x. 16; Luke xv. 1—10; and the same, 11—32, the beautiful narrative of the Prodigal Son, the symbol of an apostate people, as the son of the house is of the Jewish people: further, Acts x. 23, 31 sq., xi. 18. Respecting Paul, see § 220."—Pp. 150, 151.

“§ 220.

“Jesus Christ (*a*), the Son of God, called with this predicate sometimes in a theocratical (*b*), and at others in a physical (*c*), metaphysical (*d*), and moral sense (*e*), was born, according to the general or Dionysian calculation, in the year 753 A.U.C., and in the forty-fifth year of the reign of Cæsar Augustus (Luke ii. 1) (*f*). The Gospels of St. Mark and St. John give no account of the birth, childhood, and education of Jesus; the two first chapters of St. Matthew and St. Luke, which contain the relation of his birth and infancy, appear to have been separate small writings. According to them, Jesus was conceived (*g*) by the Spirit of God, born at Bethlehem, of Mary, a virgin, of the house of David (Matt. i. 6—17; Luke iii. 23—31), brought up at Nazareth (*h*), and as it appears, educated for a rabbi, or doctor of the law, whilst he, according to Jewish custom, learnt a handicraft (Mark vi. 3).

“(a) Jesus, i. e. the Saviour, Redeemer (Matt. i. 21), Christ, i. e. the Anointed, King, משיח, the Messiah, is called in the Gospels Χριστός: with few exceptions by the *nomen appellativum* Messiah; but in the apostolic writings mostly by the *nomen proprium* Jesus.

“(b) ‘Son of God’ is used in a theocratical sense in the Old Testament, regarding kings either as representatives of God or as chosen and selected by him (Psalm ii. 7, lxxvii. 6), and is thus applied to the Messiah, in whom the Jews expected to find a King.

“(c) Son of God, i. e. created by God (directly, as Adam), Luke i. 35; comp. Matt. i. 18—20.

“(d) Only by John and Paul was there united with Jesus, in a degree, an essence of the Divine Logos (John i. 1—14), or eternal Spirit (Hebrews ix. 14), a ray of the Nature of God (Heb. iii. 12), pre-existent to the world (John i. 1, 2; Heb. i. 10—12), and of a Divine origin (Phil. ii. 6 sq.). This gave occasion for framing the subtle theory of the person of Jesus declared in the Church’s Athanasian Creed.

“(e) In the moral sense of God-pleasing men, whom he loves and regards as children (2 Sam. vii. 14). This title is conferred upon God’s people (Exod. iv. 22; Hos. xi. 1; Rom. ix. 26; 2 Cor. vi. 18), and on Christians (Matt. v. 9, 45; Luke vi. 35; Rom. viii. 14, 19; 1 Cor. vi. 18; Heb. xii. 6—8); on Christ, as the beloved of God (Matt. iii. 17, xvii. 5).”—Pp. 146, 147.

In these extracts we have not thought it necessary to give the whole either of the notes or of the Scripture references. Of course there are points on which it would be easy to assign reasons against the author’s statements and conclusions; while the interpretation put upon the cited texts may in many cases be open to dispute. We have not attempted to enter into any such discussions in this short notice, but only to give our readers some idea of the contents and plan of the work. We may observe, however, finally, that the fact alluded to in note (*a*) in our second extract is much too loosely, and indeed inaccurately, stated. It was long ago pointed out that the usual name of our Lord in the Gospels is *Jesus*, very rarely *Jesus Christ*, and never *Christ Jesus*; and that in the Epistles, on the contrary, the more usual name is either *Jesus Christ* or *Christ Jesus*, or *Christ* alone, *Jesus* being rare. We may add that there is but one clear and indisputable instance (John i. 18) in which the compound name *Jesus Christ* occurs in the Gospels, as a personal name; in the few others in which it appears, the reading is doubtful, and one or the other name should be omitted; *Christ* when left having the *article*, and being rather a title of office than a proper name. This statement those who are interested may easily verify.

The Encyclopædia Britannica. Vol. XIII.

THE new volume of this important work contains no one article of striking originality or power, but has its full average of readable and interesting matter. The small minority of metaphysicians will be attracted to the new article on Kant, written by Rev. John Cairns, and it is one which will reward every thoughtful reader. It has the merit, so rare with metaphysical writers, of being simple in style and perfectly intelligible. It appears also to be written in a very candid spirit; it does full justice to Kant, whose writings are described as "a prodigy of human intellect," and his influence as "one of the mightiest forces that has ever ruled philosophical opinion." At the same time, it makes no attempt to conceal his faults. To Kant we owe much of the present pernicious tendency to resort to allegory as a principle of Scripture interpretation, by which, with the help of a lively fancy, anything may be proved out of any book. Mr. Cairns thus describes Kant's treatment of Scripture:

"Nothing can be more indefinite than the position in which he leaves the life of Christ as an actual history, and the origin of the Scriptures as historical documents. He accepts the record as current and in wide credit; and as, according to the further development of his theory, the individual who has been morally born again requires for the strengthening of his principles a visible moral society or kingdom of God in which to enrol himself, and to edify himself by sympathy and union; and as, through an invincible infirmity of human nature, all such societies demand some positive religious histories and rites, grounded on alleged revelation, as the vehicles of the one moral religion and the statute-books of the one moral Church of God, Kant regards it as matter of thankfulness that the Christian revelation so greatly excels all others in its moral contents; and he ascribes it to a working of Providence—short, however, of miracle—that his revelation has proved hitherto, and will for an indefinite period prove, able to maintain its influence as an inspired authority. Meanwhile, it is the duty of the Christian theologian and preacher to interpret the historical statements of the Christian books in a moral sense, and rather to allegorize them than offend pure reason,—in no case, however, imposing them as necessary to salvation; and it is the duty of the Christian worshipper, without expecting any special blessing from the exercises of religion as the means of grace, to employ them as remembrances of moral obligation, and thus to revive and strengthen reverence for the moral law, and to cultivate a practical disposition to regard all duties as Divine commandments. The gradual disentanglement of religion from historical dogmas and positive statutes is its moral perfection, and the advance of Christianity to this stage is its own goal, the final victory of good over evil, or the coming of the kingdom of God upon earth."

All this, palpably unsatisfactory as it is, is probably the source whence some of our contemporaries have derived their philosophy of religion; although the anti-supernaturalist character of the philosophy was more fully avowed by Kant than it is by some of his English followers. Mr. Cairns justly observes that Kant's concession, involved in his tribute to the moral singularity of Christianity as the only historical religion which has exhausted the moral law, ought to have led him further, since in the circumstances of its origin this amounted to nothing less than a moral miracle.

Dr. Latham has revised the article on Language, and Mr. James Mill contributes a new article on the Law of Nations and the Liberty of the Press. It was to have been anticipated that this clear thinker and honest

writer would carry out his defence of unrestricted liberty of discussion to religion. He sums up a masterly article by stating that the only mode in which any opinion ought to be impeded is by the adduction of evidence on the other side.—Mr. Edwards, of the Manchester Free Library, contributes a very elaborate article on Libraries, in which almost every topic connected with the subject is touched upon. His details respecting the Free Libraries established under Mr. Ewart's Act are particularly interesting, and will be found transferred to our pages in a future number. We may in passing point out one error into which Mr. Edwards has fallen. The "Dr. Shepherd" who established the Library at Preston was not the Presbyterian minister and school-master of Gateacre, the author of the *Life of Poggio*, but a physician who practised in Preston rather more than a century ago.—Mr. Alan Stevenson contributes a very instructive and interesting account of Lighthouses.—Dr. Simpson, of Edinburgh, a short but valuable article on Leprosy, which the general as well as the medical reader may peruse with profit.—The article on Luther, by Bunsen, will probably attract the largest attention, and it deserves it. One or two brief extracts will disclose the spirit and mode in which this biography is handled :

"Luther's life is both the epos and the tragedy of his age. It is an epos, because its first part presents a hero and a prophet, who conquers apparently insuperable difficulties, and opens a new world to the human mind, without any power but that of divine truth and deep conviction, or any authority but that inherent in sincerity and undaunted, unselfish courage. But Luther's life is also a tragedy; it is the tragedy of Germany as well as of the hero, her son, who in vain tried to rescue his country from unholy oppression, and to regenerate her from within, as a nation, by means of the Gospel; and who died in unshaken faith in Christ and in his kingdom, although he lived to see his beloved fatherland going to destruction, not through but in spite of the Reformation."

"Both parts of Luther's life are of the highest interest. In the epic part of it, we see the most arduous work of the time—the work for two hundred years tried in vain by councils and by prophets and martyrs, with and without emperors, kings and princes—undertaken by a poor monk alone, who carried it out under the ban both of the pope and the empire. In the second, we see him surrounded by friends and disciples, always the spiritual head of his nation, and the revered adviser of princes and preacher of the people; living in the same poverty as before, and leaving his descendants as unprovided for as Aristides left his daughter. So lived and died the greatest hero of Christendom since the apostles; the restorer of that form of Christianity which now sustains Europe, and (with all its defects) regenerating and purifying the whole human race; the founder of the modern German language and literature; the first speaker and debater of his country; and at the same time the first writer in prose and verse of his age."

Of Luther's translation of the Scriptures Dr. Bunsen thus speaks :

"On the 21st of September, 1522, the translation of the New Testament appeared in two volumes, folio, which sold at about a ducat and a half. The translation of the Old Testament was commenced in the same year. Thousands of copies were read with indescribable delight by the people, who had now access to the words of Him whom Luther had preached to them as the author of our salvation, in their mother tongue, in a purity and clearness unknown before, and never surpassed since. By choosing the Franconian dialect in use in the imperial chancery, Luther made himself intelligible both to those whose vernacular dialect was High German or Low German. Luther translated faithfully but vernacularly, with a native grace which up to this day makes

his Bible the standard of the German language. It is Luther's genius applied to the Bible which has preserved the only unity which is, in our days, remaining to the German nation—that of language, literature and thought. There is no similar instance in the known history of the world of a single man achieving such a work. His prophetic mind foresaw that the Scripture would pervade the living languages and tongues all over the earth—a process going on still with more activity than ever."

Nothing better shews Luther's faith in the human mind than his earnest plea for education as the best bulwark of the Reformed religion. "Forget not," said he, addressing his countrymen, "the poor youth. Look how the ancient Jewish, Greek and Roman world lost the word of God and perished. The strength of a town does not consist in towers and buildings, but in counting a great number of learned, serious, honest, well-educated citizens. Do not fancy Hebrew and Greek to be unnecessary. These languages are the sheath which cover the sword of the Spirit. The ignorance of the original Scriptures was an impediment to the progress of the Waldenses, whose doctrine is perfectly pure. How could I have combated and overthrown Pope and sophists, even having the true faith, if I had not possessed the languages? You must found libraries for learned books, not only the Fathers, but also the Pagan writers; the fine arts, law, history, medicine, must be represented in such collections." These expressions, says Dr. Bunsen, "prove that from the very beginning and in the very person of Luther, the Reformation was connected with scholarship, with philology in its most extended sense, and equally with the highest aspirations of the fine arts."

Dr. Bunsen alludes to Luther's controversies with the Reformed on the Sacramental question as the dark side of his life; but refers with satisfaction to his dying speech to Melancthon: "Dear Philip, I confess to have gone too far in the affair of the Sacrament." The whole article will reward the reader's attention.

A Half Century of the Unitarian Controversy. By George E. Ellis. 8vo. Pp. 511. Boston. 1857.

It is with no small regret that we bid adieu to Mr. Ellis as the Editor of the *Christian Examiner*. This handsome volume is a collection of his essays in that excellent periodical, having particular reference to the origin, course and prominent subjects of the Unitarian controversy among the Congregationalists of Massachusetts. Mr. Ellis writes with full knowledge of his subject, and in an admirably candid spirit. We do not, indeed, sympathize with his often-repeated expressions of distaste to controversy, believing as we do that it is by controversy, and by it alone, that truth is established in the world. We rejoice with him in the manifestations of a freer theological tendency even in creed-bound churches; but it is only the *beginning* of a desirable end. From the class of theologians represented by Kingsley, Maurice, Jowett and Stanley, we expect good unquestionably, but an amount of good far less than they might produce if they would throw themselves unreservedly on the principles which they appear to have adopted. Mr. Ellis notices, but scarcely with the *censure* which it surely deserves, the deplorable apathy of Unitarians in upholding the agencies and institutions for the promotion of distinctively Unitarian principles. If, as he says, the proportion of the indifferentists amongst us be as ten to one (but is not

this an exaggerated estimate?) it need no longer surprise us that Unitarianism does not make the progress to which it is entitled. It has made and is making progress. If this result has been effected by so small a fraction as one-tenth of its available force, how altered would have been the condition of the Protestant Church throughout the world if every man who accepts and comprehends Unitarian truth had been faithful and zealous in its diffusion!

On the subject of sceptical Transcendentalism, Mr. Ellis writes strongly, and, in reply to an orthodox critic on his essays, denies that it is the natural outgrowth of Unitarianism.

"The differences," he says, "between Orthodoxy and Unitarianism arise from questions of interpretation; questions about the meaning of sacred records whose value and authority are admitted by both parties, and which Unitarians have always shewn themselves so zealous to maintain, that they have produced works of acknowledged superiority in defence of revelation and the Scriptures. Transcendentalism, so called, denies a revelation, pronounces its miraculous sanctions to be philosophically impossible and absurd, and subverts the authority of Scripture. * * * As a matter of fact, Transcendentalism, and even New-England Transcendentalism, was not the outgrowth of Unitarianism, but an imported product that had been developed from German Lutheranism. A few young New-England Unitarians have attracted attention to themselves in connection with their adoption of that form of philosophical scepticism because of their eminent talents as men of marked endowments. But very many of the undistinguished Orthodox have adopted the same views independently of Unitarianism."

Sermons by Rev. Ephraim Peabody, D.D., Minister of King's Chapel, Boston. With a Memoir. 8vo. Pp. 388. Boston. 1857.

THE beautiful features of the author of these Sermons, beaming with intellect and sensibility, in the portrait prefixed to this volume, would have led us to seek acquaintance with his inward thoughts, had we not already known how pure, exalted and noble they were. Dr. Peabody was removed from the faithful performance of earthly duties last November, at the age of forty-nine. He had been pastor successively at Meadville, Cincinnati, New Bedford and Boston; and wherever he ministered, he made his influence felt, as a man who combined earnestness and taste, pure religion and a free intellect. We have read many of these sermons, and with unqualified admiration. They are varied in subject and treatment, yet all are imbued with a deep Christian feeling,—reverential, humane, tender and beautiful. This little volume may help to correct the idea, sometimes thrown out by flippant youths, that the reception of the outwardly miraculous in revelation is a hindrance to spirituality. Dr. Peabody's rich spirituality of mind was not in spite of, but one of the fruits of, his reverent acceptance of Scripture. The miracles narrated in the New Testament were no more a hindrance to his earnest faith, than were the marvels of creating skill and sustaining power which science unfolds in the material world. It was his privilege to study at Cambridge under Andrews Norton, the theologian of New England. A freer mind than his it would not be easy to find. If Dr. Peabody owed much in his studies preparatory for the pulpit to his Theological Professor, then Mr. Norton's example, in strict adherence to Scripture exegesis, may be safely recommended to those who assume the responsible office of Professors of Theology.

INTELLIGENCE.

LAYING THE FOUNDATION-STONE OF THE
NEW GRAVEL-PIT CHAPEL, HACKNEY.

We have in a previous No. recorded the fact that the Hackney congregation have found it necessary to pull down the chapel which they have occupied nearly half a century. It was erected in 1809-10, during the early period of the ministry of the late Rev. Robert Aspland. The architect of the chapel was Mr. Edmund Aikin, and Mr. Seabrook was the contractor. Ecclesiastical architecture was in the beginning of the century at its very lowest point of debasement, and neither in design nor execution did the New Gravel-Pit chapel raise the standard of architectural taste and skill. Before twenty years had passed, it was found that substantial and costly repairs were necessary. These were made at an expense of more than £2000. During the ministry of Mr. Boucher a settlement of the walls took place, and Messrs. Lawford and Heneker, the architects, advised a rebuilding, rather than another attempt at repairing. The scheme was entertained, and would, had Mr. Boucher continued the minister, have probably been carried into execution. Owing to the unsettled state of affairs in the society, nothing was done. In 1855, a new school-room and vestry were built at the back of the chapel, in place of those originally constructed on the same site. It was then discovered that the whole building was in a ruinous and very dangerous state. Mr. Sancton Wood, the architect, was called in, and his opinion was so decided that the congregation felt that they had no alternative, but must rebuild their chapel. They sought for plans, and chose that of Mr. Henry A. Darbishire, which gives promise of a commodious and elegant place of worship.

The style of architecture adopted for the new building is that which prevailed during the latter part of the thirteenth century, generally known as the Early Decorated. The plan is cruciform in arrangement, and consists of an entrance vestibule at the west end, flanked by north and south staircases which lead to the organ-gallery above. Nave, 68 ft. long, 19 ft. 6 in. wide, and 42 ft. 6 in. high, with north and south side aisles, each 50 ft. long, 9 ft. wide, and 18 ft. high; north and south tran-

septs, 18 ft. wide, 12 ft. deep, and 35 ft. high, with porch entrances to each; chancel, and, adjoining altar, plate-closet, and minister's entrance from vestry. The walling generally will be executed in Kentish rag with Bath-stone dressings; the roof-framing will be open, stained and varnished; and the benches and other wood-work will be of the simplest character. The piers which separate the nave from the side aisles will be of cast-iron, quatrefoil on plan; they support timber uprights, which carry the pole plate upon which the roof-framing rests. Carved timber ribs spring from the feet of these uprights and form the nave arches, the spandrils of which will be filled in with inch-and-half boarding, perforated with tracery. The main ribs of the roof, which span the nave transversely, also spring from the uprights, the framing of the aisle roofs acting as an abutment and answering the purpose of the usual clerestory walls. This arrangement is economical in cost and effective in execution, and it possesses the advantage of obviating the necessity of heavy nave piers, which too frequently interfere with the convenience of our present form of worship. The chapel will contain 500 sittings on the ground floor, and seats for 70 children and the choir in the west gallery. It will be heated by means of hot air, conveyed under the aisle paving from a heating chamber in the basement of the south transept, the necessary apparatus being supplied by Messrs. Haden and Son, of Trowbridge. The gas-fittings will be of brass, executed by Messrs. H. Debauffer, of Fish Street, City. The contractor for the whole work is Mr. G. J. Carter, of Holloway.

The congregation having raised a considerable sum, though far short of the amount which will be required, resolved to commence the undertaking. Preparations were made for a public ceremony on the occasion of laying the corner-stone. The day selected, Friday, June 26, proved, except in respect to the great heat, very favourable to their purpose. Soon after one o'clock, a numerous and highly respectable assembly of persons met on the ground, including, in addition to those who took part in the ceremony, several representatives of the neighbouring

congregations and ministers from different parts of the country. The girls of the school sang very sweetly the fine hymn, composed by Sir John Bowring at the time when he was an accustomed worshiper at Hackney, beginning,

Ancient of Ages ! humbly bent before Thee. *

At the close of the hymn, Rev. Chas. Beard, B.A., of Gee Cross, read a Psalm and a very impressive prayer. The Treasurer of the congregation, Mr. John E. Clennell then stepped forward and presented to James Aspinall Turner, Esq., M.P., a handsome silver trowel, with this inscription :

Presented to

JAMES ASPINALL TURNER, Esq., M.P.,

On the 26th June, 1857,

On the occasion of his Laying the Foundation-stone of the

Unitarian Church, Hackney.

Rebuilt 1857.

In presenting it, Mr. Clennell said: Mr. Turner—Sir, As the Treasurer of the New Gravel-Pit congregation, the honour devolves upon me of presenting to you this trowel. I am to request that you will accept it as a memorial of the proceedings of this day. And I will only add my sincere desire that the Church you have so kindly assisted us to erect may be filled for successive generations by sincere and devout worshippers of the One God the Father, and true and faithful disciples of his beloved Son, our Lord and Master, Jesus Christ.

Mr. Turner then proceeded to lay the stone with the accustomed ceremonies. It had this inscription :

Dedicated

To the Worship of the One God the Father.

This Stone was laid by

JAMES ASPINALL TURNER, Esq., M.P.,

On the 26th day of June, 1857,

As the Foundation of the New Church for the use of the Unitarian Congregation of this place.

The former Building, erected in 1810 on this site (the Foundation-stone of which is here preserved), was taken down on account of its insecurity.

JOHN E. CLENNELL, Treasurer.

H. A. DARBISHIRE, Architect.

Immediately contiguous to it will be placed the foundation-stone of the previous building, which bears this inscription :

* See both the hymn and the tune composed by Miss Christie, in *Monthly Repository*, XVII. 372.

Sacred to the One God, the Father.

This Stone is laid as the Foundation of a Building for the use of the Congregation of Unitarian Christians assembling in the Gravel-Pit Meeting-house in this vicinity : Monday, Oct. 16, Anno Domini 1809.

ROBERT ASPLAND, Minister.

EBENEZER JOHNSTON, Treasurer.

EDMUND AIKIN, Architect.

Mr. Turner having spread the mortar, the stone was lowered to its proper place and adjusted after the masonic mode and pronounced to be correct. He then shortly addressed the assembly, thanking them for the honour they had done him in inviting him to assist in a ceremony so interesting to them. He was almost a stranger amongst them, but he was gratified in finding himself supported on the occasion by some old friends. To one of them, Rev. R. Brook Aspland, the event of the day must be one of deep and solemn interest, reminding him as it would of the services, so long continued on that spot, of his late honoured father. Although the building in which those services had been given was no more, the principles taught survived; and it was an auspicious circumstance that the congregation were so zealously affected, that they were now preparing to build a beautiful chapel on the site of the former building. He congratulated them on their zeal, and trusted they would be able to complete their design without difficulty, and open their new house of prayer without the burthen of a debt. It gratified him also to find that the architect selected by the congregation was the son of an old friend of his, the late Mr. James Darbishire, of Manchester. He believed that the principles which the Unitarians held were as important as they were scriptural and true. In reference to the inscription on the stone which had just been lowered to its place in their presence, he observed that they had recorded the fact of his being a Member of Parliament. He did not speak of this from any personal vanity, but to assure them that he was not alone in the House of Commons as a friend of Unitarian opinions. He found himself associated in that House with several gentlemen of no small weight in the country holding similar opinions. The circumstance was satisfactory, as shewing that however small the Unitarian body was as to numbers, it was not insignificant in respect to

intelligence and the respect and confidence of large portions of their fellow-countrymen. He concluded by uttering his best wishes for them as a religious society, and for the promotion of the noble truth which was their bond of union.

Rev. R. B. Aspland then delivered an address appropriate to the occasion, as did Rev. Thomas Madge. As the Committee of the Gravel-Pit congregation have requested both gentlemen to print the addresses, we need attempt no outline even of what they said. The children again sang a hymn, the beautiful one by Montgomery,

This stone to Thee in faith we lay.

Mr. Madge then offered a prayer, and the proceedings on the ground were terminated by Rev. Edward Tagart's giving the benediction. The friends then adjourned to the school-room, where fruit and other refreshments were prepared. Under the presidency of the Treasurer, a brief but friendly exchange of sentiments took place, the speakers being chiefly the gentlemen who had taken part in the previous service.—It is supposed that the new building will cost about £3500. Of this sum about two-thirds are raised; another subscription will be shortly made by the congregation; and with the help of friends to them and their cause, on which under their peculiar circumstances they are certainly entitled to reckon, we may venture to echo Mr. Aspinall Turner's expectation that the new chapel will early next year be opened and be free from debt.

SOUTHERN UNITARIAN SOCIETY.

The annual meeting of the Southern Unitarian Society took place on Wednesday, July 8th, at Wareham. In the morning, the Rev. J. L. Short introduced the service, and the Rev. Wm. Forster delivered an eloquent discourse from John xiv. 7—11, shewing that the *Fatherhood of God*, the burden of Christ's preaching, had been clouded by the creeds of Christendom, and portraying that pure faith as needful to encourage the penitent and comfort the afflicted in all ages. We forbear further comment on this able discourse, as its author has yielded to an earnest request for its publication. In the evening, the Rev. H. Solly conducted the devotional service, and the Rev. William Forster addressed a deeply interested audience from 1 Cor. i. 22—24. In

the course of the services, which were numerous attended, some anthems were excellently performed.

At the business meeting of the Society, the Rev. D. Griffith, pastor of the congregation, was in the chair, and the Secretary, the Rev. E. Kell, read the report. After alluding to the book and tract distributions during the past year, the report mentioned the trying position of Newbury,—one of the congregations in its district,—in consequence of the threatened loss of its chapel endowment from the neglect of former Trustees to fill up vacancies in the Trust, and the refusal of those now existing to comply with the wishes of the congregation to appoint others. The Trust had referred the case to the Charity Commissioners, who had placed it in the hands of the Attorney-General, and though no doubt was entertained of his favourable decision, yet much needless and vexatious expense had been incurred. The report noticed with regret the dissolution of the Christian Tract Society, whose admirable tracts had always formed a very useful portion of its Catalogue, being especially beneficial for the promotion of practical piety among the humbler classes of our congregations. It expressed the hope that the Committee to whom was entrusted the winding-up of the concerns of the Christian Tract Society and the transference of its stock, would endeavour to connect its publications with some other Society which would not only continue them in circulation, but provide for the publication of a greatly enlarged number of tracts.

After the report had been received and adopted, John Brown, Esq., moved, and the Rev. J. Darby seconded, "That the best thanks of the meeting be presented to the Rev. William Forster for his able and eloquent discourse."

Freeland Filliter, Esq., moved, and the Rev. J. Cropper seconded, "That this meeting, rejoicing in the triumphant majority of 140 by which the Oaths' Bill, which removes all disabilities to the admission of the Jews to Parliament, was passed in the House of Commons, heartily desires that it may be equally successful in the House of Lords, and recommends to its Committee to prepare a Petition to that House in favour of the measure."

The Rev. J. L. Short proposed, and the Rev. M. Rowntree seconded, "That this meeting, having heard with regret of the dissolution of the Christian Tract Society, trusts that the Society to which

the Committee may transfer its stock, will provide for the perpetuation and the increase of publications, so almost essential to the working of our congregational benevolent institutions."

It was proposed by Rev. E. Kell, seconded by William Pike, Esq., "That this meeting, recognizing the Sunday-School as a most important agency in building up our Christian societies, begs most cordially to welcome the Rev. Henry Solly as a representative of the Sunday-School Association."

J. Batston, Esq., moved, and Rev. J. Darby seconded, a vote of thanks to and re-appointment of the Secretary and the Committee.

Dinner was provided between the services at the Bear Inn, when eighty-two persons sat down, the largest number ever present on such an occasion at Wareham. The Rev. L. Lewis ably presided, and the company was addressed by Mr. Bishop and the Revs. William Forster, E. Kell, J. L. Short, J. Cropper, H. Solly, M. Rowntree and J. Porter, on various topics connected with the diffusion of Christian liberty, truth and righteousness.

A delightful spirit of earnestness, zeal and harmony, characterized the proceedings of the day. The visitors from a distance, of which there were many, were gladly and hospitably welcomed to tea at the houses of the members of the congregation.

WESTERN UNITARIAN SOCIETY.

The sixty-sixth annual meeting of the members of this Society was held at Bridport on Wednesday, July 1st. Several visitors from the congregations at Dorchester, Crewkerne, Colyton and other places, were present. Divine service was held at the chapel in the morning. The Rev. G. Brock, of Exeter, offered the introductory prayer and read the Scriptures; the Rev. A. Worthington, B.A., offered the general prayer; and the Rev. J. J. Tayler, B.A., delivered a discourse on the Nature and Office of the Holy Spirit, from John xiv. 15—17, which for clearness of scriptural exposition, nicety of metaphysical analysis, and beauty and power of spiritual application, has seldom, if ever, been surpassed. Before the sermon, an anthem of Mozart's, the words from Psalms xxxv. 24, lvii. 9, 10, was sung by the choir, under the direction of Mr. R. Pinney, organist of the chapel, in a way that reflected much credit upon them.

A cold collation was provided at the Assembly-room by the members of the Bridport congregation, to which all visitors were invited. About 170 persons sat down to this repast, Thomas Hounsell, Esq., of Wykes Court, presiding. After the usual loyal toasts had been given, Mr. Staples, the Secretary, was called upon to read the annual report, which stated that "during the past year 43 new members have been admitted, and 3403 publications have been selected from the Depository. The present number of members is 276, a number that has not been exceeded since the formation of the Society; and exclusive of grants, a greater number of books has been issued this year than has been the case during any former period."

The Rev. J. L. SNORT proposed, "That the cordial thanks of the meeting be given to the Rev. J. J. Tayler for his clear, learned and impressive discourse delivered this morning." He had never before, he said, felt so deep a desire to retire at once into privacy, and digest and incorporate into his spiritual being, as best he could, those beautiful words, that full and masterly exposition of scriptural truth, which he had had the privilege of listening to that morning. He expressed an earnest wish that Mr. Tayler might consent to have the sermon printed.

The Rev. R. GIBSON, B.A., in seconding the resolution, expressed the feelings of admiration, mingled with melancholy, with which he had heard the discourse. It was remarked by Bishop Burnet that the best proof of a preacher's eloquence was the fact that his hearers went away smiting their breasts and exclaiming, "God be merciful to us, sinners!" Such had been his prevailing feeling at the close of Mr. Tayler's discourse; for he then felt, for himself, that if he were a spiritual man at all, he was only in the very first stage of spiritual life. He rejoiced especially in having a present and sensible proof that the young men preparing for the ministry at Manchester New College were under the influence of a man of the highest attainments and most beautiful spirit.

The resolution was unanimously carried with much applause.

The Rev. J. J. TAYLER, B.A., in replying, said that he had received the best reward of a preacher—the assurance that he had succeeded in conveying to the minds of others those truths which had made a deep impression on his own. For want of the time, how-

ever, that would be necessary for revision before publication, and for other reasons which he detailed, he could not conveniently commit his sermon to the press at present, but he hoped it might appear at some future day in connection with others.

Some further resolutions having been carried, the meeting separated for a time, only to assemble again in the same room, and others adjoining, where tea was provided at five o'clock; after which refreshment, those who had partaken of it, and many others, adjourned to the Town Hall, where a public meeting was held, the Rev. J. L. Short in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN observed that he thought these demonstrations, if made in a right spirit, were essential to the development of the important truths that they, as Unitarian Christians, held. He was not of the number of those who thought the theology which men hold is of no importance; for whilst he admitted that the religious elements in our nature had their various expressions in different sections of the church of Christ, he could not but believe that the theology which they were privileged to hold was adapted, above all others, to bring men into nearer communion with Christ, and to admit them to, while it trained them to appreciate, the privileges of being "sons of God." It seemed to him to be one of the great functions which God had imposed upon their body to separate the theology of the age from the corruptions that had been added to it by heathen philosophy, and to bring it back to the simplicity of the truth as it is in Jesus. That function was one of the most important that could be entrusted to them, inasmuch as it was calculated, not only to produce the highest Christian results in believers, but also to stem the tide of scepticism that, in this age of free thought, was setting in. So far as they could shew that Christianity was in harmony with the great wants of man's nature—so far as they could prove that the highest, best and noblest elements of that nature are dependent for their fullest development on Christ's religion—they were doing service to their fellow-believers, and, with all humility be it said, they were doing God service.

The Rev. D. GRIFFITH, of Wareham, proposed the following sentiment:—"That while we welcome speculative truth from every source, and earnestly seek to obtain the highest views of God, of duty and of destiny, we especially welcome Christ's character as at once

the central truth and the most beautiful exposition of the gospel." Mr. Griffith observed that the sentiment not only perfectly accorded with his own views, but, it seemed to him, it also defined the position assigned to us by Providence in the great work of Christian progress. To us has been entrusted the task of vindicating the essential harmony between reason and faith. Reason and its claims had been overlooked by the greater number of Christian divines. Creeds had been formed, in various ages of the church, for the purpose of rendering the exercise of the individual reason unnecessary. The era of the Reformation witnessed the first general effort to cast off these restrictions, but that effort had been attended by only partial success, as they had evidence in the Christian world of to-day, if we looked to the Established Church and many of the Dissenters, as in the case of Dr. Davidson. It is one of the great functions of the Unitarian church to vindicate absolute freedom of thought in the sphere of religion, and as soon as we suffered this freedom to be in the slightest degree infringed upon, we should be abandoning the great principle for which our forefathers toiled and suffered, and surrendering the grand distinction which could alone justify our denominational existence. He did not mean to affirm that reason was of itself sufficient to build up a living Christian organization. Thought may furnish the foundation-principles of a system, but it is the heart alone that can furnish the life, giving current whence the elements of a living organization can be derived. In the character of Christ these two great elements were more harmoniously combined than in any other being. Upon his life alone could a safe foundation for the highest religious faith be built; upon this let them raise the standard of their church, and they would find that the gates of hell could not prevail against it.

The Rev. J. J. TAYLER, B.A., in seconding the resolution, observed that it might sometimes strike a thoughtful mind, that whilst everything else in our nature is represented as constantly progressive, our moral and spiritual life was sketched out for us nearly 2000 years ago. Our industry and our science seemed destined to indefinite progress: no one could say where they would stop. Why, then, it might be asked, was the moral and spiritual type of humanity already stamped out, as it were, and held up to our view in the

light of history—a type beyond which it was not expected that man's nature would advance? It seemed to him that the reason was this,—that until the moral type of humanity was fixed in some historical form, there could be no harmonious, no real progress made by any of the other elements of our nature. Till man had revealed to him the several relations in which he stood to his Maker, what concord could exist between those elements? The stages of human civilization that preceded the era of Christianity, whether they looked at the industrial pursuits of the Egyptians, the commercial activity of the Phœnicians, the philosophy of the Greeks, or the military and legislative genius of the Romans, seemed to have been a species of experiment. Mere intellectual progress could not constitute the happiness of a nation. Let them look at France. A more intellectual people did not exist. What had they not done in the most abstract branches of science, in history and in philosophy? More brilliant products of intellect could not be found than in the French philosophers. Yet the French nation had floated on the waves of chance, of every random speculation, though not without feeling the want of some religious faith. Having cast off Christianity and thrown themselves on the exercise of the individual reason, they had failed to find anything that could take the place of an historical religion. He believed that in the recognition of the Christ, men had the only true foundation for a religion that could satisfy the deep cravings of the spiritually-minded, and that we, as Unitarians, in virtue of our manifold advantages, were in a position to receive the impression, in all its force, of a perfect life as we have it exhibited to us in the Christ. There was also a great necessity in the present day that men should have a definite form of opinion on religious subjects, arrived at by careful and earnest thought and study. In their attainment, many mysterious questions might occur to the mind; but where these were purely intellectual, we must be content to leave them, and find in faith and love that spiritual sympathy which links men to each other by immortal ties. The nearer the churches drew to Christ, the greater would be the richness and the freshness of their spiritual life.

The Rev. A. WORTHINGTON, B.A., of Bridgwater, in proposing the next sentiment, "That personal holiness,

originating in an active faith and expressed in a practical life, is at once the process and the proof of a true reconciliation with God," observed, that where a reconciliation has to take place, it is necessary to know to whom we have to be reconciled. We considered that the reconciliation demanded in the gospel was on our part toward a Father who is ever willing to take us to himself, and to pour into our hearts, if we will but open them, that Holy Spirit which alone can make us one with him. The condition on which so blessed a consummation may be obtained is, that we be holy in the discharge of our humblest duties, "as God is holy:" and the means by which this holiness may be insured is faith—not faith or belief in any creed, however theologically true, for the mere assent of the intellect could not insure the surrender of the soul—but that entire trust in Christ and in God which results in a loving obedience to their commands and an eager fostering of their spirit. That is the process by which the gospel reconciliation is to be obtained; but it cannot be effected momentarily. A true atonement with God must be worked out day by day in the pursuits of life, until, in the fulfilment of them all, we should enjoy that peace which passeth understanding. He thought he saw indications of a conscious, or, it might be, an unconscious acknowledgment of this in all the great movements in the Christian church, and specially in those philanthropic movements which characterized our own day. In the Educational, the Missionary, the Reformatory movements of this generation, men seemed to think it was essential that they should work them out as great thoughts of God, and that they were at-one with Him in doing it. Let this idea be once lodged in men's minds and permitted to influence their hearts, and we should find the different sections of the Christian church arriving at a unity of spirit by a process they little suspected, and no longer anxious to know *how* the result was effected, when they found that a true reconciliation had taken place.

Mr. R. H. GIBSON, B.A., student of Manchester New College, proposed, and supported in a clear, manly and effective speech, of which we regret we have not notes, the following resolution—"That our warm sympathies and ardent admiration be extended to those small bands of noble men who, amid the menaces of the Romish Church

and her imperial despots, have maintained their allegiance to a liberal, scriptural theology at all hazards and at all costs, save those of honour and of duty."

The Rev. G. BROCK proposed the fourth sentiment—"That the history of the Christian Church, no less than the wide-spread and undeniable wants of our own times, teaches us that, avoiding sectarian aggressiveness and bitterness, we should be faithful in the exposition and dissemination of the gospel as we have received it from the oracles of our faith." Mr. Brock observed that if the gospel really was what its name implied—if it were felt to be glad-tidings from Heaven for the elevation and perfection of the human mind and heart, for the salvation of the human soul—there could be no doubt but that the dissemination of the gospel, as they had received it, was an important duty which all true believers were bound to perform. Let them not say now that there was no occasion for any controversy; for, so long as error existed, it was their duty to do what they could to throw a ray of divine truth upon it.

The Rev. W. JONES, M.A., in seconding the resolution, said that the subject was one of increasing importance to his own mind. They were bound by the relation they sustained to each other, as children of the same Father, to communicate to others what they deemed of benefit to themselves. If they were desirous to build up the truth of Christ in another's mind, they would find it necessary to take down the structures they regarded as foreign to that truth, and lay a new and a firm foundation. He felt bound to make known to his fellow-men his views of religion, just as he felt bound to communicate the light of science. As a religious body they would lose much of their respect if they did not go forward and make known the sentiments of their common faith. By the allegiance they owed to God, they were bound to do this—in the spirit of charity and gentleness indeed, not as contending for the victory, but as disseminating truth—and their work, if undertaken with due humility, would not be without its effects. If they rightly used the means God had given them, all would be well. They had to do with duties—results were in God's hands.

The Chairman being about to close the meeting, the Rev. R. GIBSON, B.A., rose and said he felt that it would be

highly inappropriate and unbecoming, and quite contrary to the wishes of all present, that the proceedings should be brought to a conclusion without a vote of thanks to the Chairman. The preservation of order on occasions like the present was essential to their proceeding prosperously, and they therefore could not feel otherwise than obliged to him by whose arrangement and influence order had been preserved. But, besides this, he was anxious to take this opportunity of expressing the high value he set on the character of the gentleman in question (who must now be considered as out of the chair and for a few minutes out of hearing) as a private individual and as a minister of a congregation. He differed, indeed, from Mr. Short in many things, nor did he deem him a *faultless* man. Indeed, he should not like to be in the neighbourhood of a *faultless* man. Such a man would be an annoyance to him, or an object of envy. But the excellent qualities of their Chairman threw all his failings into the shade. He (Mr. Gibson) felt for him the sincerest and most earnest esteem. Mr. Short had, on one or two occasions, partly in earnest and partly in joke, said "that Mr. Gibson, he had been told, came into the neighbourhood to save him from being spoiled by some of his people." Well, if that had been the motive, it would not have been altogether a despicable one. It were worth while to save from spoiling, a man whose influence in his congregation and neighbourhood was of so elevating and purifying a tendency. But, in fact, if they would excuse a little personal talk, one of his (Mr. Gibson's) leading motives for choosing this neighbourhood for his abode was, that he should thus be placing himself and his family within reach of the ministry of a man who would be likely to carry them forward in the spiritual life—one who would teach, not the doctrines of any sect, but the things which he himself had learned by his individual search and received as truths. Nor had his expectations been deceived; nor could he think the esteem and trust he felt towards Mr. Short could ever perish from his heart.

THOMAS COLFOX, Esq., seconded the resolution.

The CHAIRMAN, with much emotion, acknowledged the thanks conferred on him by such men, in such a way, and expressed his trust that their sympathy would but aid him to yet higher and

nobler efforts. The 607th hymn in Martineau's Collection was then sung, and a benediction given by the Chairman. Thus ended a meeting which, throughout, was pervaded by a pre-eminently Christian spirit, and the whole tone of which was not only gratifying, but encouraging.

SERVICES AT THE OLD PRESBYTERIAN
CHAPEL, HALL BANK, BUXTON.

- July 5. Rev. John Colston, Dean Row and Styal.
12. Rev. Jos. Ashton, Stockport.
19. Rev. Wm. Whitelegge, M.A., Cork.
26. Rev. Thos. Hunter, Coventry.
Aug. 2. Rev. John C. Lunn, Evesham.
9. Rev. T. E. Poynting, Monton.
16. Rev. Jas. T. Whitehead, Hale and Altrincham.
23. Rev. J. Wright, B.A., Bury.
30. Rev. John Owen, Lydgate.
Sept. 6. Rev. Joseph Hutton, LL.D., Derby.
13. Rev. B. T. Stannus, Sheffield.
20. Rev. H. Green, M.A., Knutsford.
27. Rev. Lindsey Taplin, M.A., Todmorden.
Oct. 4. Rev. George H. Wells, M.A., Gorton.

Morning service at Eleven o'clock;
Evening service at half-past Six.

PRESBYTERIAN COLLEGE, CARMARTHEN.

The annual examination of the students at this College began on Tuesday, June 30th, and lasted four days. A large number of ministers of different denominations were present. The examination was conducted partly by written questions and partly *viva voce*, which made it extremely interesting to the visitors. The examiners were the deputation from the Presbyterian Board, the Revds. H. Solly and T. L. Marshall, and T. F. Gibson, Esq., ably aided by Dr. Davison, of Dudley, the Rev. D. D. Jeremy, of Warwick, and the Rev. J. E. Jones, of Bridgend. The examinations at this College are *bona fide*, the students being examined, not in portions of books selected by the Tutors, but anywhere in the books and subjects professed to have been read during the session. On the present occasion the young men were examined (in the department of the Classics and Greek and Roman History) in Greek—the Apology and Crito of Plato; first and third books of Ho-

mer's Iliad; the Prometheus of Æschylus and the Medea of Euripides; the Memorabilia, Agesilaus and Anabasis of Xenophon; the Acts of the Apostles, Epistle to the Romans, and the two Epistles to the Corinthians. In Latin—the Odes, Satires and Epistles of Horace; the Cataline and Jugurthine War of Sallust; Cicero, de Senectute; Livy, book xxi., and Virgil, Georgics, book i.; Greek and Roman History. In the Theological department—Moral and Mental Philosophy, Rhetoric, Butler's Three Sermons, Church History, Ancient Philosophy, Reid by Hamilton, Logic, Questions on the Synoptical Gospels, and German. In the Hebrew and Mathematical department—Hebrew, English History and Grammar, Geometry and Algebra, Geography, Chemistry and Natural Philosophy.

On Friday, the last day, the distribution of the valuable Prizes annually given by Lewis Loyd, Esq., of Overstone Park, Northamptonshire, took place. The first Prize was awarded to Robert Roberts, who has since passed his matriculation examination at the University of London in the first class; the second, to W. D. Davies and Wm. Edwards, equal; the third, to John Oliver; the fourth, to Rhys Jenkyn Jones; the fifth, to David Edwards.

The two Prizes given by S. Sharpe, Esq., London, for the best examination in Biblical Criticism and Antiquities were awarded—the first, to Thomas Edwards; the second, to John Lloyd James.

Two Prizes were also given this year by the Principal, Dr. Lloyd, for the best examination in Greek and Roman History. That in Greek was awarded to John Oliver, and that in Roman History to Frederick Roberts.

The following students were honourably mentioned: Thomas Davies and Lewis James (whose ill health during the session had greatly interrupted their studies), John Thomas, Stephen Davies, David Oliver Edwards, John Davies, John Smith, William Rees, William Hughes. All the students were reported to have conducted themselves satisfactorily, and valuable books were presented to each of them, as a mark of approbation of their good conduct.

After the distribution of the Prizes, the students were very feelingly and impressively addressed by the deputation. This was Mr. Gibson's first visit, who expressed himself much gratified with what he had seen of the College.

He had witnessed many examinations in London and elsewhere, and he could confidently say that he never saw young men acquitting themselves better. He thought the education given at this College was of a very high character, and wished that more of the young men would take their degrees at the University of London. The whole was concluded by an impressive prayer offered by the Rev. Hugh Jones, the Independent minister of Carmarthen.

The only saddening circumstance connected with this examination was the absence, from failing health, of the Rev. D. Davison, M.A., who for more than thirty years had conducted these examinations in a most able and efficient manner. Long will his name be remembered and cherished here, as that of one of the best friends of the College, and one of the most earnest promoters of education on the broad basis of perfect freedom of conscience.

A VISIT TO THE MANCHESTER TREASURES OF ART.

On Monday, July 20, the members of the Old chapel congregation, Dukinfield, provided a pleasant and instructive day's entertainment to the teachers of their Sunday-school. Accompanied by some of the congregation, who acted as guides, the teachers spent the day in the Palace of Art Treasures at Old Trafford. It has been complainingly remarked by some of the journalists that the operatives of Lancashire shew no appreciation of the wonderful Exhibition now open near Manchester, and that even when taken to the beautiful building by their employers, they wander about uninterested, and, soon wea-

ried, betake themselves to coarser pleasures. This was happily not the case with the Dukinfield teachers, who, whether their attention was directed to the wonderful productions of the old or the modern masters of painting, to the fine collection illustrative of British history and literature in the Portrait Gallery, to the ancient tapestry, or the modern work in silver, ivory and wood, displayed an intelligent and unwearied interest. Both the guests and those who assisted them in their repeated walks through the Palace greatly enjoyed the day; and the kindly and happy feelings produced by the union of members of a religious society of different ranks in intellectual enjoyment, could not but assist in quickening their zeal and mutual confidence in the performance of their important duties in the Sunday-school. When the party sat down to dinner in Mr. Donald's spacious refreshment-room, it numbered 84, of whom 70 are regular teachers in the school.

MANCHESTER NEW COLLEGE.

At the recent meeting of the Trustees there were some warm proceedings on the subject of the appointment of a Hebrew Professor, and by some of the Trustees displeasure was expressed at the prevention of Mr. Tayler and Mr. Kenrick's intended recommendation of Rev. G. V. Smith to that office. The matter is now settled by the appointment of Mr. Russell Martineau, son of Rev. James Martineau, as Hebrew Lecturer, on the recommendation of Mr. Tayler and Mr. Kenrick and some German literati. Mr. Russell Martineau's attainments in Oriental languages are, it is said, remarkable.

MARRIAGES.

June 22, at the Old chapel, Dukinfield, by Rev. R. Brook Aspland, M.A., Mr. WM. STANLEY BURTON, of Stalybridge, to HANNAH, daughter of the late Mr. Josh. CHEETHAM, of Newton Heath.

July 2, at Little Portland-Street chapel, London, by Rev. W. H. Channing, Dr. BODICHON, of Algiers, to BARBARA LEIGH, eldest daughter of Benjamin SMITH, Esq., of Blandford Square.

July 4, at the New meeting-house, Birmingham, by Rev. Samuel Bache, Mr. WILLIAM FRANKS BEALE to CATHERINE CHRISTIAN HUTTON. Also, at the same time and place, Mr. HENRY BOURNE to

EMILY SUMNER HUTTON,—the eldest and youngest step-daughters of Mr. John Collyer, of Edgbaston.

July 5, in Essex-Street chapel, London, by Rev. Thomas Madge, the Rev. EDWARD HIGGINSON, of Wakefield, to EMILY, daughter of the late George THOMAS, Esq., solicitor, of Carmarthen.

July 5, at the Unitarian chapel, Chesterfield, by Rev. W. Smith, of Rochdale, Mr. ISAAC TAYLOR to Miss ANN JACQUES.

July 19, at the Old chapel, Dukinfield, by Rev. R. Brook Aspland, M.A., Mr. WM. HARRISON to Miss EMMA HARROP, both of Mottram.